DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 816 EA 007 607

TITLE	Year-Round Education Dream and Reality. A Report of the National Seminar on Year-Round Education (7th, Denver, Colorado, May 11-14, 1975).
INSTITUTION	Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.; National Council on Year-Round Education.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	120p.; A related document is ED 083 735
AVAILABLE FROM	Colorado State Department of Education, 530 State Office Building, Denver, Colorado 80203 ($5.00, Quantity discounts, Make checks payable to 7th Year-Round Education Seminar)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Administrative Personnel; Community Involvement; Curriculum Development; Educational Economics; Educational Facilities; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Extended School Year; Higher Education; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Principals; Public Relations; *School Community Relationship; Teachers; *Year Round Schools

ABSTRACT

This seminar report contains the speeches of the two featured speakers (Dr. Calvin M. Frazier and Dr. Charles E. Silberman), the seminar papers of nearly 90 presenters, and biographical information on the speakers and presenters. (IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113816

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION DREAM AND REALITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A
REPORT
OF THE
7th
NATIONAL
SEMINAR ON
YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION
MAY 11-14, 1975 • DENVER

EA 007 607

2

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, CALVIN M. FRAZIER, COMMISSIONER
DENVER 1975

PRICE: $5 each, single copies;
multiple copies from 5 to 9, $4.50 each;
10 or more, $4 each

Make checks payable to:
7TH YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION SEMINAR
and send to:
Colorado Department of Education
530 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Compiled by the Communications Services Unit
of the
Colorado Department of Education
with assistance from
The Colorado Chapter
National School Public Relations Association

SEVENTH NATIONAL SEMINAR
ON YEAR–ROUND EDUCATION

SPONSORED BY THE COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
FOR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robin Johnston, Chairman ..... Denver
Lewis E. Stieghorst, Vice Chairman ..... Littleton
Betty Fellbert, Member ..... Aurora
Bill Graham, Member ..... Beulah
Allen B. Lamb, Member ..... Windsor
Dr. Calvin M. Frazier, Colorado Commissioner of Education

CO–SPONSORING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Cherry Creek School District 5
-- Dr. Richard P. Koeppe, Superintendent

Colorado Springs School District 11
-- Thomas Doherty, Superintendent

Jefferson County School District R-1
-- Dr. Alton W. Cowan, Superintendent

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON YEAR—ROUND EDUCATION

NCYRE OFFICERS:

President -- James R. Gove
Valley View Public Schools, Romeoville, Illinois

Vice President and President Elect -- Dr. Don Glines
California Department of Education, Sacramento, California

Secretary-Treasurer -- Dr. John D. McLain
Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania

Immediate Past President -- George M. Jensen
Horse Shoe, North Carolina

NCYRE BOARD MEMBERS:

James Bingle, Plainfield, Illinois
Geneva Brown, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Dr. Bruce Campbell, Trenton, New Jersey
Mrs. Joy Christopher, Denver, Colorado
Dr. Franklin Edwards, Phoenix, Arizona
Dr. Gene Henderson, St. Charles, Missouri
Dr. Ernest Mueller, Fallsington, Pennsylvania
Dr. Paul D. Rice, Blacksburg, Virginia
Dr. Leonard Servetter, Chula Vista, California
Verne F. Shelley, Denver, Colorado

NCYRE ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATORS:

Region I
Mrs. Adelia Nichols, Huntington Beach, California

Region II
Dr. William D. White, Lakewood, Colorado

Region III
J. Pat Page, Romeoville, Illinois

Region IV
Dr. David Parks, Blacksburg, Virginia (National Headquarters)

Region V
Dr. E. Curtis Henson, Atlanta, Georgia

PREFACE

Based on comments we have heard, the Seventh National Seminar on Year-Round Education was well received by seminar participants. The Colorado State Board of Education was pleased to sponsor the event along with assistance from the co-sponsoring Colorado School Districts, Cherry Creek, Colorado Springs, and Jefferson County.

We are indebted to the many persons in Colorado who served on the state seminar planning committee, which was headed by Dr. Roslyn M. Grady of Colorado Springs, Dr. William White of Jefferson County, and Verne Shelley and Mrs. Joy Christopher, both of Cherry Creek School District.

Appreciation is also expressed to the nearly ninety persons from throughout the Nation who served as presenters for the seminar and whose seminar papers, for the most part, appear in this publication.

We hope you will find this material of interest and assistance.

Robin Johnston

Robin Johnston, Chairman
Colorado State Board of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION: DREAM AND REALITY -- DR. CALVIN M. FRAZIER 1

II. YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING -- DR. CHARLES E. SILBERMAN . 4

III. JOB ALIKE SESSIONS

A. ARCHITECTS AND SCHOOL BUILDING PLANNERS
1. DR. GLEN I. EARTHMAN 10
2. F. LAMAR KELSEY 11

B. CENTRAL SCHOOL STAFF ADMINISTRATORS
1. THOMAS J. MCCONNELL, JR. 12
2. DR. GEORGE H. DALGLEISH 13
3. CHARLES E. RUFIEN 14

C. CURRICULUM SUPERVISORS
1. DR. JOHN W. WASHBURN, JR. 16
2. MRS. MURIEL BRAINARD 17

D. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
1. MS. CHRIS SHORT 18
2. MRS. RUTH WOMACK 20
3. MRS. DOTTIE BRENNER 20

E. ROLE OF THE NON-CERTIFICATED PERSON IN A YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL
1. MRS. LUREE WOLFF 21
2. MRS. DONNA GERBOTH 22
3. MRS. NANCY KLEIN 23

F. PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL CONCEPT
1. MRS. SYD JOSEPH 24
2. MRS. JANET TCZAP 25
3. THOM FOULKS 26

G. THE EFFECT OF YRE ON THE LOCAL CHURCH PROGRAM
1. THE REVEREND WESLEY M. HANSEN 27

H. YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL AND THE PERSONNEL OFFICE
1. ROBERT HAMPSON 27

I. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
1. DR. DAVID J. PARKS 28

J. YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL AND SCHOOL ACTIVITIES
1. RAY BALL 29

K. BOARD MEMBERS LOOK AT THE CONTINUOUS SCHOOL YEAR PLAN
1. JAMES D. BINGLE 30
2. JOHN L. WIMAN 31

L. SCHOOL BUSINESS MANAGERS IN A YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL
1. RONALD N. STRAHANOSKI 32

M. SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS
1. DR. GENE HENDERSON 33

N. SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL
1. DR. ERNEST H. MUELLER 34
2. MRS. JOY CHRISTOPHER 35

3. Del Harding 36
4. Thurman Warner 37

D. Secondary School Principals and Teachers
1. Dr. Daniel Knueppel 37
2. Arvel R. Ricketts 39
3. Ray Schneringer 40

IV. Interest Alike Sessions

A. Year-Round Schools for the Neophyte
1. N. B. Triplett 41
2. Dr. William White 42
3. Dr. E. Curtis Henson 44
4. Martin Rubinstein 45

B. Year-Round Schools for In-Betweeners
1. Ms. Chris Short 47

C. Year-Round Schools for Oldtimers
1. Dr. Gene Henderson 48
2. Ray Schneringer 49
3. Dr. Don E. Glines 49

V. Panel Sessions

A. A Year-Round Education Model Designed to Achieve Academic Excellence Its Graduates
1. Dr. Dwain L. Thatcher 50
2. Robert H. Williams 51

B. A Look at Year-Round Education Operating in Colleges and Universities
1. Dr. Edward C. Frederick 52
2. Dr. John D. McLain 53

C. Comparing Pupil Achievement in Year-Round Schools and in the Traditional Setting
1. Dr. Roslyn M. Grady 54

D. Learning from Failure -- A Community Rejects Year-Round Education
1. Dr. James C. Mounie 55
2. Dr. Wesley Apker 56
3. Dr. Guilbert C. Hentschke 58

E. Year-Round Education -- Success Stories (And a Few Bruises)
1. C. J. Nichols 58
2. James D. Bingle 60
3. Dr. Daniel Knueppel 61
4. Charles E. Rufien 62
5. Mrs. Dottie Brenner 63

F. YRE -- Pros and Cons from Parents and Students
1. Mrs. Lynn Engleby 64
2. Miss Robin Hamilton 66

G. I Was Recruited as a Year-Round School Superintendent (Twice!)
1. William Rutter 67

VI. How We Did It Sessions

A. Change--Traditional to Continuous Calendar

1. Delaine T. Richards 70

B. Year-Round Education in Sunnyside: A Sound/Slide Presentation
1. Dr. Patrick Henderson 72

C. Year-Round School Program K-12
1. Dr. William D. White 73

D. Is the Intersession Program for Your School?
1. Delaine T. Richards 75

E. "A Tale of Four Cities"
1. Martin Rubinstein 77
2. Ms. Chris Short 78
3. Dr. Wesley Apker 78

F. Identifying the Background Conditions of a Sepcific Community in Order To Tailor a Year-Round School Plan to that Community
1. Dr. John D. McLain 79
2. Dr. John W. Washburn, Jr. 80

G. Initial Planning for Year-Round Education Programs
1. Dr. Robert H. Williams 81
2. Dr. Bruce Campbell 82

H. Establishing Two-Way Communication and Dissemination of Information from the Planning Through the Implementation Stages
1. Mrs. Joy Christopher 82
2. James R. Gove 84
3. Dr. James C. Mounie 86

I. Planning and Revising Curriculum
1. Mrs. Mary Milligan 87
2. Thomas J. McConnell, Jr. 88
3. Dr. William D. White 89
4. Dr. Don E. Glines 91

J. Extending the Classroom K-12 into the Community
1. Dr. E. Curtis Henson 92

K. Budget
1. Dr. Harald Drewes 93
2. Ronald N. Strahonoski 94

L. Staffing and Inservice
1. Charles E. Rufien 95

M. Educational Evaluation
1. Ray Schneringer 97

N. Vocational Education, Career Education and Year-Round Schools
1. Dr. Arvin Blome 98

VI. Biographical Sketches
A. Featured Speakers 101
B. Biographies of Presenters 103

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION: DREAM AND REALITY

DR. CALVIN M. FRAZIER
COLORADO COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DENVER, COLORADO

Three years ago I attended the Fourth Annual Year-Round Conference held in San Diego. Year-round education proponents were stressing the potential of the Year-Round concept as a means of saving dollars, using facilities to a better advantage, and redirecting educational programs.

Things have changed considerably in these last three years. San Diego may have been a high point of the Year-Round education movement--at least for the next few years. National conditions in 1975 are not the same as those in 1972--and considerably different than the circumstances operating in 1968 when the first conference was held.

There are various reasons I feel the YR concept should be considered by local schools--not as an end in itself but as a vehicle for educational reform and a solution to local space problems if such difficulties exist.

Although a few districts may have launched a YR project for purely educational reasons, this motivation would have to be an exception. Most did so because the YR approach was seen as the best of several options open to local school patrons. It was a choice between long distance busing, double sessions, extended school days, or a YR schedule that allowed a building to serve more than its judged capacity.

When judged against these other approaches, I think there is every reason to list the YR school as the most educationally desirable, although extended school days and long distance busing need not mean a reduction in educational quality. The extended school day may in fact have some pluses that make it attractive. I'd list double sessions--that is, a class meeting a minimum number of hours in the morning and another class coming in in the afternoon--as being the poorest option of the four. But a YR program, when run well mechanically, can actually mean program gains to students--and a solution--albeit a temporary one-- for a growing community.

School boards may want to utilize the YR calendar as an interim approach during a growth cycle because the growth pattern in an area is not yet established or the growth is an influx for a limited time period of several years. YR schools can be the means of avoiding overbuilding or misplacement of facilities. Where districts are still growing and adequate housing may not be acceptable for several years, the school board should give serious study to the advantages of the YR concept.

If the YR alternative is selected, then there ought to be a commitment to provide the educational assets possible, along with the schedule change. But parents and students should be able to see visible, obvious program pluses. When they do, the adoption and implementation of a YR program can go considerably easier.

The mechanics of implementation are somewhat disruptive, to the staff as well as the patrons, so the educational gains must be highlighted throughout. This may even cost some additional allocations to these schools over the ones on the traditional schedule; but to offset some of the inconvenience and encourage acceptance of change, additional resource inputs can be justified.

What are the educational advantages? Let me list some, at least as they might be found in a Concept 6 or 45-15 program, and possibly others, such as the trimester, quarter, or quinmester plans.

1. Some tremendous enrichment programs have been developed in the 15-day intersession time in a 45-15 plan. In the same way, schools in Concept 6 have a similar opportunity in the extra offerings scheduled to complete 180 expectations. These "enriched programs" have been fun and stimulating to teachers planning them - and have found their way into regular school programs. These special, often off-campus type projects, have been stimulated by YR schools; but they have

impacted the whole system.

2. Students not in school have educational opportunities available to them which they did not have before. In some cases, it is returning for special enrichment or remedial type programs in the regular offering or returning for intersession activities.

3. A better use of the time/facilities has been made. Whereas, at the secondary school level primarily, we've had registration days, meaning partial days, or handing-out report cards and a partial day again, schools are in session serving students regularly. These other routines are handled in the auditorium or cafeteria for out-of-school students.

4. The program supplements planned have often involved community-centered activities or activities in another region, state, or country. Spanish classes traveling to Mexico would be an example of the latter. Extended field trips have been disruptive in the past because, e.g., science teachers resented a student's absence caused by social studies field experiment.

5. I think there has been an impetus to a more personalized education. Because there is the potential for students to alter their attendance patterns, better records have generally been kept on all students. Counselors can continue to see a student even when that student is out of school because counselors have continued "their" year Physical education classes emphasizing personal conditioning have had students come back in to periodically check their continued physical fitness emphasis, rather than experiencing a three-month drop-off.

6. Some additional "quickies":

Both the 45-15 plan and Concept 6, to a perhaps lesser extent, call for a shorter break between sessions; and the "summer drop" or "retention" can be reduced.

Summer attendance, while posing some counter problems for some, offers a weather and summer program potential unused in the 9-month school cycle.

Work-study possibilities, at least on the Concept 6 plan, should tap summer work placement stations previously not utilized.

Teacher opportunities are expanded under these plans. Teachers wanting to work longer can have some opportunity to contracts of 200-220 days, still giving adequate vacation possibilities; or teachers on the YR plan can substitute for traditional schools. Not only is additional money earned, there is an inservice-plus coming forth.

I've dwelled primarily on some of the gains that can accompany a YR program. CAN should be stressed. Such opportunities may or may not exist, although I feel these aspects are worthy and do operate in many instances.

There are some dangers to be avoided:

1. Where the educational enrichments have not been developed or made visible, opposition has developed and the YR plan has been disruptive and devisive to a community. I think there is a high correlation between implemented, visible benefits and community acceptance of the plan.

2. Mechanical aspects can become extensive in terms of student scheduling, reporting, home communication, staff planning, and maintenance considerations. Commitment has to be made to staff adequately for meeting these problems or face some terrible PR problems.

3. Home and community conflicts are not to be minimized. Churches are concerned about summer camp problems, city recreation programs can be affected. The loss of summer vacation flexibility is a problem to some and a relief to others. In a tourist area some employers do not encourage summer vacations and the prospect of fall or spring traveling is greeted warmly.

4. Finally, since few school changes affect so many aspects of the community and the family so heavily, an ongoing involvement needs to occur on the part of laymen. They, particularly the critics, should assist in assessing the alternatives--possible problems--and the evaluation of the program if YR schools are begun. Local involvement is generally to be favored over outside consultants whenever possible.

The same caution should be urged for heavy staff involvement. The association and union affiliates can see many threats in the YR program and these should surface early rather than a few weeks before the curtain is due to rise.

The YR movement should be viewed in terms of some major thrusts elsewhere in education. For example: considerable attention is being given to the curricular and organizational aspects of junior and senior high schools. Such a review should be supported by YR school concepts and planning. For districts entering into a secondary focus for the next few years the two concepts should be mutually supportive.

Again, with the community area thrust of most YR projects, these two efforts should go hand in hand.

Direct observation and involvement in business, social services, and various career clusters can be enhanced by YR programs emphasizing intersession offerings. These intersession or extra-scheduled activities may be one way of expanding the college-bound student exploration that is often lacking.

Dropout retention was a subject of a major conference held recently in Denver. The problem involved was how to make school more appealing and fulfilling and reduce at least somewhat the 900,000 dropouts. Schedule variations, along with the curriculum overhaul that usually takes place in YR planning, can be a definite factor in retaining some students.

Parallel to this concern is the look at Alternative Schools or Options in Education. The YR program can provide options in ways now very difficult for the regular school calendar. YR schools may not suffice for some of the motivation in establishing an alternative school. Since philosophy, discipline, and learning theory are often deeply involved, and a certain amount of escapism from the system exists in the advocates. This type of frustration will probably not be addressed by a YR pattern either.

Accountability, that is, the public's concern that schools have a more clearly defined purpose, some identified priorities, and some evaluation of progress, relates to the YR school impact too--or rather it should. I do think that schools moving into a YR plan show a great degree of purpose, planning, and evaluation. So this public interest should be met.

Staff renewal is a growing problem for many districts and the profession as a whole. Another is low turnover--a lack of stimulus from new teachers. Reluctance to grant risk money to schools has also reduced the stimulus educators have had in the past. YR programs have tended to be tremendously rewarding and stimulating and have to be seen as at least one way of combining student educational gains with staff rejuvenation.

In closing, let me acknowledge one over-riding comment. I'm supportive of the YR program concept because I feel this has been a force for educational improvement in most communities. In some instances this has not been the direction taken by YR programs. Then, like the 9-month effort, it can mean just more of the same--and even be disruptive because of the multitude of mechanical problems that can develop.

YR programming, despite its leveling off somewhat because of the decline in population and, to some extent, the economic climate, will be around. YR schools have that potential and will continue, therefore, to draw advocates.

The dream will be maintained through the realities of the economy and declining student enrollment because the YR dream also holds within it the reality of change and improved student learning. So it is that YR education is both a dream of things to come and the reality of gains achieved, which makes the conference title a most appropriate one.

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING

DR. CHARLES E. SILBERMAN
DIRECTOR OF THE STUDY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
THE FORD FOUNDATION
AND
NOTED AUTHOR

The task I have set for myself today is to play devil's advocate. I would like to raise some questions and share some concerns that the literature on year-round education--or that part of the literature I have read--has evoked in me.

Since the concerns to which year-round education speaks are heavily managerial and administrative--I doubt that we would be meeting here today if cost and efficiency were not such pressing concerns. I have taken the text of my sermon today from the closest thing to Holy Scriptures I know of in the management area, the writings of Peter F. Drucker. Professor Drucker is generally considered to be the leading authority on management in the United States, if not the whole free world.

The most frequent explanation that is given when services institutions fail to perform as well as we would like, Drucker suggests in his monumental treatise, Management, is that such institutions are not managed in a sufficiently businesslike manner. The remedy, in this view, is for administrators of service institutions to behave as if they were businessmen. This "is the wrong diagnosis," Drucker writes, "and being businesslike is the wrong prescription for the ills of the service institution.....

It is effectiveness and not efficiency which the service institution lacks. Effectiveness cannot be obtained by businesslike behavior as the term is understood, that is, by greater efficiency."

This distinction between "efficiency" and "effectiveness" is central to Drucker's view of the nature and role of management. Efficiency means getting things done the right way; the emphasis tends to be on procedure, often with the implicit assumption that the right results will be achieved automatically if the proper procedures are followed. Effectiveness, on the other hand, means getting the right things done.

The function of management is to be effective--to make the organization effective. But it is not possible to be effective unless one knows what it is that one wants to accomplish--and it is not possible to know what one wants to accomplish unless one has asked, and keeps asking, what the organization's goals are and what they ought to be.

The major goal of the manager, whether of a public school system, a business corporation, a hospital, a museum, or any other organization, is to ask the uncomfortable questions that others usually tend to take for granted: What are we doing? Why are we doing what we are doing? What are the consequences of what we are doing? Is what we are doing what we should be doing? If not, what should we be doing?

The failure to ask those questions, and keep asking them, is the primary cause of business failure; it is also the primary cause of unsatisfactory performance in public education and indeed every other service institution.

None of this is to suggest that efficiency is irrelevant; too little concern with efficiency means that we run the risk of being tripped up by some small and overlooked detail. "For want of a nail, the kingdom was lost." But too much emphasis on efficiency is more dangerous, turning procedures into ends rather than means to ends; no kingdom has ever been won simply because the horses were properly shod. All of us, I am sure, can think of any number of instances in our own organizations--when we were employees, of course, rather than managers--when efficiency was given precedence over effectiveness, when procedures and routines began to be worshipped as ends, thereby getting in the way of achieving the real objectives.

Some of you may be wondering what all this has to do with year-round education; the answer,

I submit, is that it has everything to do with year-round education. The failures of public education in this country--and if we are to be honest with one another, we must recognize that there are large failures as well as great successes--have far less to do with efficiency than with effectiveness.

Educators are human beings, and we have the normal failings of that species--which is to say that all of us tend to get so caught up in our day-to-day routine that we fail to ask ourselves the hard and uncomfortable questions about this purpose--educational purpose. Given the superman pressures placed on school superintendents and principals and state commissioners, and the unending demands to which they must respond--usually yesterday rather than tomorrow--it is difficult to find the time to think seriously and deeply about the purposes of education, and about the ways in which educational techniques contribute to those goals or prevent them from being realized. But that is what our job demands of us.

I did not find that kind of thought in the literature on year-round education that I have read. For all the thoughtfulness about the techniques of administering schools on a year-round basis--for all the concern with techniques for making the transition to a year-round calendar, and the various means of gaining parental and public support--I was disappointed at the relative absence of thought about the purposes of education and the ways in which those purposes may be affected by a change in calendar. In some of the papers I read, the questions of purpose and goals was not raised at all; in others, the substance and goals of education were discussed, but in a manner that made them clearly subordinate to the administrative requirements growing out of the change.

Let me be specific. One of the papers I read contains the following passage:

> "Before adequate legislation can be written to cover year-round school operation, the legislators should know that school boards and administrators, before their consideration of such plans, must carefully map out the reasons for their interest, asking such questions as:
>
> "Why?"
>
> "What is our primary objective?"
>
> "Do we want to save money? Better utilize our available facilities? Extend the time available for use of vocational educational equipment?"

Now, saving money and using facilities more efficiently are legitimate and important objectives, which is--or should be--to improve the quality of education offered all children. Yet that goal is not listed, let alone defined, in this paper, which is representative of the literature as a whole.

To be sure, the paper does briefly discuss curriculum. But listen carefully to how curriculum is discussed. "If the current curriculum of a school district converting to a year-round plan does not conform to the new learning periods, it must be modified..... It is generally agreed that short, preferably self-contained (not interdependent) curriculum units better allow needed instructional flexibility..."

I wonder if the good people who wrote that passage really heard what they were saying! Let me play it back to you: "If the current curriculum of a school district converting to a year-round plan does not conform to the new learning periods, it must be modified..." I did not come here to defend the educational status quo; if you have read anything I have written, you know that I am not a great admirer of the existing curriculum in most schools. On the contrary, the curriculum, along with almost everything else, needs a massive overhaul.

But if a new curriculum is to be developed, it should not be a by-product of the exigencies of scheduling. Rather, the curriculum should grow out of educators' carefully thought and deeply believed views of the nature of childhood and adolescence, of the nature of teaching and learning, and of the purposes of education. To make curriculum a function of the calendar--perhaps it would be more precise to say, a function of the computer used for scheduling--is to make efficiency God. And we know what the Bible says will be the fate of those who worship false gods!

What makes me doubly concerned is that the scheduling requirements of year-round education seems to push the curriculum and the teaching methods in precisely the wrong direction. That is a strong statement, but my concern is a strong one, and I shall elaborate. Perhaps it would be appropriate first to recall an incident from an autobiographical volume I have been reading. Describing a friend whom he had met lately, the author writes, "One of his great moments occurred during a lecture. He suddenly came to a full stop, and stared up at the audience portentously. 'I suppose,' he said sternly, 'that you are by now aware that you are listening to one of the most bigoted men you have ever heard speak.'"

Let me describe the direction in which year-round schooling seems to push the curriculum. Then let me explain why I think it is the wrong direction, by contrasting it with the right direction--the "right direction," of course, being the one that I prefer. The passage I just quoted described the wrong direction: "Short, preferably self-contained (not interdependent) curriculum units better allow needed instructional flexibility." The author of another paper suggests that "curriculum should be tied to three-week rather than nine-week segments in order to accommodate the moving in and out of vacationing tracks and still maintain continuity."

To explain what troubled me so much, and what I hope will trouble you when I am done, let me sketch in a view of the nature and purpose of education as a backdrop against which to assess the particular changes we are talking about.

The major purpose of education, I submit, should be to educate educators, which is to say, to turn out men and women who are able to educate themselves, who have the desire and the capacity to take responsibility for their own education, and who are likely, therefore, to be not just year-round but life-long, self-directed learners. "Being educated," as my friend, David Hawkins of the University of Colorado, has written, "means no longer needing a teacher." Or as Sir Alec Clegg, one of the great contemporary English educators, puts it, the object of education "is not so much to convey knowledge as it is to excite a determination in the child to acquire it for himself and to teach him how to go about acquiring it."

The most influential child psychologist of modern times, Jean Piaget, puts it in an even broader context. "The principal goal of education," he insists, "is to create men and women who are capable of doing new things, not simply of repeating what other generations have done--men and women who are creative, inventive, and discoverers," who "have minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything they are offered."

Nothing less than this will do. The children who will enter school next September--or whenever school begins on your calendar--will still be in the labor force in the year 2035; we cannot even imagine what society will be like then, let alone what kinds of jobs they may have. If we do no more than train them to fill the existing slots in society--if our goal is no more than the acquisition of knowledge--we will cripple them for effective lives in the 21st century. We must remember, as one educator has put it, that you cannot memorize the future. YOU CANNOT MEMORIZE THE FUTURE.

We can help students prepare for the future, however, by making sure that students develop the capacity to educate themselves--by nurturing in them a sense of competence, a sense of being actors as well as spectators, of being people who have the competence and the knowledge and the desire to shape their environment and not simply be passively shaped by it.

This view of the purposes of education has profound implications for the curriculum. It means a high priority for the Three R's, for the "development of skills and acquisition of knowledge," of course. But it means a higher priority for children's ability--and their desire--to use the skills and knowledge they develop and acquire.

When I visited a particularly exciting school in a London slum some years ago, I asked the headmistress about her students' reading scores; her answer has haunted me ever since. "I will show the reading scores, of course," she answered, "but after you have seen them, what will you know? If I turn out a generation of students who have the ability to read, but who do not read, or who read nothing but the tabloids, I shall have failed. I want to educate a generation that loves to read and that can exercise taste and discrimination in what it reads! I want to educate students who enjoy poetry and drama and great novels--and art and music and dance as well."

The lesson is clear: We must attach great importance to children's learning how to read--

but we should attach equal importance to such questions as: Do children enjoy reading? Do they in fact read? What sorts of books do they read?

The same is true for the other two R's. We should ask not simply whether students know how to write, but whether students enjoy writing, and how much they write, and what kinds of writing they do. And we should ask whether students enjoy mathematics, whether they know how to think mathematically, whether they apply their mathematical knowledge outside the math period itself.

This may sound self-evident. Yet, all too often, we manage to convert those inquisitive, active learners who enter school at age five or six into youngsters who, at least while they are in school, appear to be passive, apathetic, sometimes docile and sometimes hostile non-learners. Students who begin school eager to learn are rapidly turned off from learning.

This is the essence of the crisis: The fact that more and more students are turned off from learning, that all too many students see learning as something distasteful, and fail to develop the capacity to take responsibility for, and to direct, their own learning--or, for that matter, their own behavior.

Why is this happening? The most important reason, I submit, is the way we organize our classrooms, and the way we think about the curriculum they contain. The way in which the conventional classroom is organized implies that the teacher is the source of all knowledge, the person who decides when learning will stop. Education is conceived of as the one-way transmission of information from teacher to students, not as an active process; one teacher whose classroom we observed, in fact, had a sign in his room that made this view explicit. The sign read, "Available - Free - Knowledge - Monday through Friday, 9 to 3 - bring your own containers"--as if the students were simply empty vessels to be filled. If the sign was unusual, the attitude was not.

We turn kids off from learning in other ways--for example, by the kinds of rules we establish and maintain--most particularly by the inane insistence that students sit silently and motionless the entire school day, a rule that is utterly foreign to the nature of children, or for that matter, to adults as well. When I testified before a Senate committee, the staff director called me any number of times before I went up to the Hill to remind me that my written testimony could run as long as I wanted, but to please, please, not let my oral testimony run more than 15 minutes, because the Senators would begin to fidget, and would want to ask questions. I don't think that that is any criticism of the Senators; you will begin to fidget if I run on too long. And yet we somehow assume that children, or adolescents, will sit silently and motionless for 40 or 50 minutes at a time, all day long.

We destroy children's desire to learn by the mindless curriculum we inflict on them as well--by the obsession with names and dates and so-called facts unrelated to any ideas or concepts, and by the failure to recognize what we all know as adults, that learning is likely to be more effective if it grows out of what interests us as well as what interests our teacher. A friend whose grandchild was visiting her last Christmas discovered that the youngster hated science. Curious about the reason, she asked him, "What is science?" The child answered with the contempt children show when adults ask the obvious: "Oh, science is filling in the lines." When my youngest son heard me tell the story for the first time, he added, "That's what social studies is, too, Daddy."

We destroy students' desire to learn, too, by the kinds of punishment we use. When students are punished by being kept after school, or by being required to read an extra assignment, we are telling them that school is so unpleasant, that reading and learning are so painful that the worst thing we can do to them is to give them more of it!

But we do worse than that! Another major purpose of education should be to develop self-reliant, independent, autonomous human beings--to develop men and women who have the desire and the capacity to take responsibility for their own behavior as well as for their own learning. Most schools, I am sad to report, subvert discipline rather than develop it. For discipline--true discipline--is not the capacity to behave "properly" while being watched; it is the capacity to behave the same way whether one is watched or not. Most schools destroy discipline in this sense; for when students are always being watched, when they are never given an opportunity to assume responsibility, to make choices, to make mistakes (for we all know, as adults, how often

we have learned from our own mistakes), it is unreasonable to assume that they will develop into responsible human beings.

For students to learn to take responsibility for their learning or their behavior, there must be trust--trust in students' desire to learn, trust in their capacity to learn through their own explorations, and trust in their capacity for growth and fulfillment. Without such trust, teachers will not feel free to permit students to make choices, to take responsibility--and perhaps most important, to make mistakes and to learn from those mistakes.

Another kind of trust is equally indispensable--trust in the individual classroom teacher. Unless teachers receive trust and respect from administrators, parents, and school board members, they will feel unable to encourage their students' exploration.

What this means is that classrooms should be as much teacher-centered as they are child-centered; they must be open to the teacher's growth and fulfillment no less than to the students'. For children are not likely to grow in classrooms in which teachers are little more than clerks or technicians administering instructional packages prepared by someone else.

The view of education that is implicit in most of what I have read on year-round education, and explicit in some, runs completely counter to the approach I have just sketched. Take the apparent need to break the curriculum into a large number of small, discrete, self-contained units, for example. This runs counter to what I think we know about the nature of knowledge, which is interdependent and interrelated. It runs counter to what I think we know about the nature of teaching and learning and the nature of child and adolescent development, which requires us to look at a youngster's learning and development over a period of years, rather than weeks. If there is a pedagogic fault in the traditional calendar, particularly where children of elementary school age are concerned, it is that it forces teachers to take too short a view of their students' development! To organize a curriculum in self-contained units of five or six weeks is to force students to adjust to the needs of the institution, instead of adapting the institution to the needs of the students!

Some of you may be thinking (or even muttering to one another) that I have missed the point--that year-round schooling encourages individualized instruction and suggest that the more flexible scheduling a year-round program requires will encourage such individualization. But I am talking about "individualized learning," not "individualized instruction." There is a profound difference between the two. Individualized instruction conceives of education as something teachers do to students; as I suggested before, individualized learning conceives of education as an active rather than a passive process--as something students do to themselves, with a teacher's help and under a teacher's guidance. Individualized instruction does not permit individual students to define their own goals or to try to reach their goals, or the teacher's goals, in their own way.

Equally important, "individualized instruction," as the term is usually used, denies teachers any active role in the process of teaching or learning. If you will forgive the irreverence, individualized instruction is a form of immaculate conception, in which information and skills are transmitted from curriculum designers to students untouched and unsullied by a classroom teacher's mind or spirit. Good teaching, I submit, reflects the teacher's interests and enthusiasms; there is no room for either in prepackaged "instructional units."

What these papers I have read call individualization, I submit, is not individualization as we usually understand the term, but rather what an industrial engineer might call mass production to narrow specifications with rigid quality control. There is no room for difference in individual interests, for differences in individual learning or teaching styles. The only individual difference that can be accommodated is speed, i.e., the rate at which different individuals cover the same prescribed material.

I use the verb "cover" advisedly, for this approach, consciously or not, views curriculum as something to be covered, which means an emphasis on information, not knowledge--on names and dates and so-called facts unrelated to any larger, organizing principles. By definition, a curriculum divided into short, self-contained, not interdependent instructional units makes it impossible for students to learn and understand the structure of the disciplines they are studying.

This is a prescription for training, not for education. Training means mastering a set of lessons--if you will, a set of skills and a body of information. Education requires training, of course; in every field, there are skills to be mastered and information to be learned.

But education is more than training--more than information and skills. As the old aphorism has it, education is what remains when the lessons have been forgotten. Or as the greatest philosopher of the 20th century, Alfred North Whitehead, put it, "Your learning is useless to you 'til you have lost your textbooks, burnt your lecture notes, and forgotten the minutiae which you learnt by heart for the examination."

Let me conclude with a story. According to legend, "Rabbi Schneur Zalman, one of the great Hasidic Rabbis of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, was imprisoned in St. Petersburg on false charges. While awaiting trial, he was visited by the chief of police, a thoughtful man. Struck by the quiet majesty of the rabbi's appearance and demeanor, the official engaged him in conversation, asking a number of questions that had puzzled him in reading the Scriptures. Their discussion turned to the story of the Garden of Eden. Why was it, the official asked, that a God who was all-knowing had to call out when Adam was hiding and ask him, 'Where art thou?'

"You do not understand the meaning of the question," the rabbi answered. "This is a question God asks of every man in every generation. After all your wanderings, after all your efforts, after all your years, O man, where art thou?

"It is a question asked of societies as well as individuals. One is almost afraid to ask it of this society at this moment in time: the crisis of American society as a whole, a crisis whose resolution" depends, in no small measure, on the kind of education our children receive. When those of us here today are asked, "Where art thou?," our answers will not be judged by the efficiency with which we have run our schools. Rather, we will be judged by the effectiveness with which we have educated a generation of thoughtful, sensitive, and humane--as well as informed--human beings.

* * *

NOTE: Dr. Silberman's speech was read by Dr. Edward Brainard of the Colorado Department of Education staff.. Dr. Silberman was unable to deliver the speech personally due to an injury he sustained two days prior to his expected arrival in Denver. Ed.

JOB ALIKE SESSIONS

ARCHITECTS AND SCHOOL BUILDING PLANNERS

Dr. Glen I. Earthman
Director of Field Services
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blackburg, Virginia

Few, if any, responsible educators advocate a YRE program which calls simply for the same kind of existing program only to be spread over twelve months rather than nine months. In some isolated examples where this approach is the case, it is usually the result of an expedient plan, developed for various reasons, which seeks fuller utilization of existing facilities.

In almost all of these cases, when more funds are available for either new or additional facilities, the year-round program usually ceases. But for implementation of a fully conceived, well developed and organized program of year-round educational opportunities, it usually means a substantial change in program that, consequently, makes added demands upon existing facilities. The logical extension of this premise then is that just as any educational program needs precise definition before facilities can be planned and designed for it, a year-round education program must also be well defined before facilities can be planned. This phase of the planning for a YRE program is perhaps the hardest job for educators, or at least it seems to be the hardest. Efficient facilities can be planned and designed to fit the needs only to the degree that programs are well defined.

The first step to be undertaken in planning educational facilities is program definition; in other words, the educator must, first of all, identify and define the teaching/learning processes that will take place within a given set of conditions.

Once the YRE program is developed sufficiently to be spelled out in terms of goals, objectives, participants, activities, processes and the like, then it is possible to begin the next step in matching the program and the facilities.

The educator must then survey the existing facilities within the school district, evaluating in terms of how the facilities will serve the defined programs. In this evaluation, the facilities are critically examined, not only in terms of space, but of equal importance, the accountrements a building needs to support a YRE program. In most cases the obvious improvement a facility will need is air conditioning to accommodate an inside educational program during the summer months. Other improvements, however, may need to be made to the facility to accommodate certain aspects of an indigenous YRE program. Whatever the improvements needed, they are identified through the survey of existing buildings.

The next step in the school planning process is the identification of new facilities to meet growth needs, followed by implementation of the total master plan. The above describes the process, but does not necessarily identify the individuals who carry out the process.

Within the context of a seminar addressing itself to "Architects and School Building Planners" concerned with YRE programs, it is incumbent that the role each person has to play must be identified and also identify the entry point each role assumes in the planning process. Others on the panel will speak about the role of the architect and the educational planner, but here it is important that the entry point be established for both these roles. Suffice it to say that both the architect and the educational planner must be involved at the earliest possible stage. The educational planner is, of course, responsible for either planning or helping to plan the educational program that will be carried out, depending upon the responsibilities assigned to this role in a particular school district. This role must be activated early in the planning process, preferably at the initial outset of the project to insure clear definition of program.

The architect must be involved in the process early enough to assist, if necessary, in the evaluation of the existing facilities. The crucial element here is that educators begin the planning process early enough to insure sufficient time to complete what is necessary for a successful start in a YRE program.

A realistic time frame for planning and implementing is needed to undertake such a massive effort as a YRE program. When educational planners and architects are involved in the early stages of the planning process and the entire undertaking has sufficient time to properly develop and allow necessary facility improvement and conversion, then a successful YRE program can be assured.

In addition to planning in a timely fashion, educators desiring to implement a YRE program need to think in terms of comprehensive planning. The entire community must be involved in any planning effort in order for a YRE program to be successful. Educators have too often thought of the year-round school program as just that--a program of the school conducted over a 12-month period. Such thinking is indeed faulty because it fails to take into consideration the many social and civic organizations that impinge upon the school program. To successfully plan a YRE program, educators must work with all segments of the community and all agencies and organizations involved with the children and youth of the community. This especially means those agencies and organizations that furnish services to children and youth, viz, the Department of Recreation.

In the majority of communities the local governmental agencies provide recreational services to the school-age population and in offering these services utilize the school facilities to house the recreational program. Obviously, in those communities and school districts where this is the case, implementation of YRE programs will complicate the operation of at least one governmental agency. YRE programs might not impede recreational programs, but it could mean that the city or county government will have to support the YRE program indirectly by buying new recreational facilities.

Whatever the impact in the local community, such circumstances as described above then demand that the school district planners employ a "total resource planning" concept. This concept almost by definition, suggests that all resources in the community be identified and utilized for the education and recreation of all children and youth. Total resource planning insures better utilization of those facilities the community now has and prevents serious and costly overlap between school district and local government.

F. Lamar Kelsey, FAIA - Architect
Colorado Springs, Colorado

At a recent meeting, school administrators made some educated guesses about the future. By 1985, they foresaw:

-- Half of all public schools will be operating year-round;
-- High school students will spend more than one-third their learning time outside the school;
-- One-fourth of all school districts will enroll three- and four-year olds in school; and
-- 95 percent of all children will finish two years of college using a federal college-voucher program.

So what's new? Viable educational programs have always been dynamic. They must be if they are to keep pace with a changing society. It is equally true that viable educational facilities must be capable of supporting change in the educational programs they serve. A well planned school building expects change in educational techniques and equipment...and in itself. Year-round education is only one of many changes the facility will face in its lifetime.

The form of year-round education varies. It may require self-contained classrooms, wide-open learning spaces, or both. It may or may not call for a departmentalized organizational structure. These decisions and lots more are based upon other factors--not primarily upon the utilization of a year-round schedule. The designers who produce good school buildings will give these matters consideration without great concern about whether the school year is to be 9 months or 12 months long.

Other things being accounted for, there are two major elements about year-round programs which exert special pressures upon school design.

Body comfort becomes a year-round concern which calls for cooling as well as heating and ventilating. To those in southern climates, this is of no special concern...they have already made cooling a part of their building design criteria. But for those who have not provided for cooling, the problem can range from mild dollar impact on relatively new buildings where provision has already been made for the installation of future cooling to severe dollar impact in school buildings--old and new--where the cost of cooling systems could range up to ten dollars a square foot of floor area. This cost factor alone could shape a decision against year-round education.

The second impact of year-round education upon the facility is the increased wear and tear it suffers due to greater use and reduced time for maintenance. The private sector has faced this problem all along but it would be a good investment to spend a little more when building or modernizing to "toughen up" the facility so it will be better able to withstand heavy year-round use. Then operating and maintenance budgets must be structured to anticipate higher wage rates caused by night and weekend work.

Facility capability and cost are factors which enter into the decision-making process when year-round education is under consideration. And the answer, "year-round use of our buildings will save us from building new schools to house growing enrollments" won't do for many districts. These days, many districts are watching their enrollments dwindle. The key questions, then, are: Will year-round education improve the quality of our educational program and will it produce a good return for hard-earned tax dollars? Hard questions...but realistic ones.

CENTRAL SCHOOL STAFF ADMINISTRATORS

Thomas J. McConnell, Jr.
Director, Computer Center
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

When contemplating the implementation of a YRE program, a question frequently asked is "What impact will this implementation have on the administration of the school district?"

From our experience in Atlanta I would say that the impact has been slight and additional staff duties to support such a system have been minimal. This is not to say that it has not cost more money. Quite the contrary.

More staff members are now assigned to full year-round duties and no tuition is being charged to those students who are attending the Fourth Quarter. (We call our YRE program the Fourth Quarter). Another factor that directly affects our revenue is that students are now finishing high school in three years instead of four and thus leaving us without this additional ADA (Average Daily Attendance). This loss of ADA obviously affects the figures that we submit to the state for reimbursement purposes.

The Fourth Quarter did require a different approach to the way the traditional summer school activity was carried out. If one thing can be identified as to why Atlanta chose to implement the Fourth Quarter Program, I think that it was the move away from the traditional academic summer program. Students were enrolling to earn extra academic credits rather than to do remedial work to make up for failures in the regular academic program.

Since more faculty and administrators are now assigned to year-round duties, obviously more of the school district's physical plants are being used year-round. The additional maintenance and operating personnel required to keep these buildings open and functioning obviously add to the payroll.

However, as I have mentioned, none of this really increased the workload of the central staff. Perhaps I should say that this has been true as far as the computer center is concerned.

The computing potential of the school district is sufficient so that activities can be scheduled to accommodate the requirements for computer service and thus really do not impact the workload significantly.

The demand for computer services for a school district does not necessarily increase because of the requirements to support the implementation of the Fourth Quarter Program. Employees get payroll checks year-round and the majority of the functions of computer services are by definition activities that must go on all year. All accounting and budgeting systems (we prefer to call it PPB), payroll functions, personnel functions and the host of general type systems functions not necessarily related to the Fourth Quarter Program must be performed by the computer regardless of the status of the Fourth Quarter Program.

The computer center is in operation twenty-four hours per day five days per week with weekends assigned to special non-scheduled activities. The first shift is dedicated to program development and tele-processing functions. The other shifts are dedicated to the normal production activity of the school district.

The real impact on the demand for computer services is via the student related activities. Students are scheduled every three months. This entails a good deal of individual effort as well as computer time. However, it is my opinion that this is not as bad as it might seem. The scheduling, grade reporting, transcript cycle is never ending. This means that individuals involved are never allowed to forget the system. Re-assignments do occur but someone else is always there to fill in the void. We are in a constant state of student related activity.

I can only relate to you our experiences in Atlanta. We have developed many automated systems and you are more than welcome to investigate any of these systems. However, I would not want to mislead anyone into thinking that these systems would provide anything more than guidelines for other school districts. I would not want you to think you could use any of the systems or applications that we have developed in this effort. They do work for us. They are available to you but they may not provide the same results in your setting that they do in ours.

In summary, I would say that there are a great number of variables that must be considered in implementing the YRE concept. One obvious factor is that of district size. A larger district would certainly realize different benefits and would face many more problems than a small district. Additionally, it might well be that below some magic number the implementation of the YRE concept would not even be feasible.

Dr. George H. Dalgleish
Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Since I notice that the emphasis for some other sessions is on topics concerning initial planning for year-round schools, etc., I will focus more on continuing concerns of some of us at the central office in terms of the year-round school. This brief listing is not designed to be exhaustive, but rather important to note that I speak from the context of a district in which only 2 of 50 schools (soon to be 5 of 52) are on a year-round schedule.

Providing supportive services in the summer to the year-round schools, services which should be comparable to those provided all of the schools during the regular school year, is extremely important and can be difficult to accomplish. This problem probably would be somewhat alleviated if the entire district were on the year-round schedule instead of only a fraction of the total schools in the district.

Efforts must be expended, in cooperation with the individual buildings, to determine what additional funds are necessary to assist these schools in meeting some problems which are unique to them because of their year-round status. Modest amounts of money properly applied can do much to assist in such areas as community relations--through newsletters, coffees, etc.--and to provide enrichment during the intersessions.

Although no severe problems have been encountered yet in terms of professional negotiations, where year-round schools are concerned, part of this situation is due to the fact that the central office has worked closely with the local teachers' organization to anticipate potential problems in such areas as working conditions and contractual arrangements.

The central office shares an important responsibility with the schools in terms of community-wide information programs concerning the year-round program. Oftentimes this cooperative endeavor involves simply the visible support for a school's year-round program as implied by the presence of central office personnel in the building during meetings with that school's particular public. Where only a fraction of the schools are on a year-round program, the central office plays a particularly important role in informing the community-at-large about that program.

Central staff personnel continue to play an extremely important role in assisting individual schools to work with other community agencies--for example, park and recreation department, YMCA, boys' clubs, scouting organizations, churches, etc.--so that the augmenting and complementing services of these community agencies, including the schools, can be encouraged and facilitated.

It is axiomatic that central office personnel should be sufficiently well-informed about the year-round program, the same as for any other major program in the district, to be able to speak intelligently and factually about most aspects of it. Too often central staff may not even be well-acquainted with the calendar for the year-round school. Such a lack of command is damaging not only to the central administrator's ability to communicate effectively with the community-at-large, it is perhaps even more damaging in terms of his inability to communicate effectively with the staff members of those schools.

Charles E. Rufien
Bear Creek-Columbine Area Superintendent
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

Regardless of the type of year-round education being considered and/or implemented by a school district, certain questions must be researched by central school administrators in order to help identify areas of operation which might be influenced by the uniqueness of year-round education.

Questions to be considered should include the following:

I Scheduling:

A. What demands upon staff and administrative service are required as students are re-scheduled continuously throughout the year?

B. What additional record-keeping services and procedures are needed to insure systematic accounting of pupil placement, pupil progress, and systematic procedures of program offerings within and between articulation areas?

II Staffing and Contractual Agreements:

A. When given the choice of work year contracts, what are the patterns which certificated and classified personnel prefer?

B. How many different contracts will be required to staff a year-round school operation?

C. Will employees regard employment in a year-round school preferable or less desirable than the traditional operation?

D. Will some employees by virtue of assignments not have identity with a particular school?

E. Will some teaching contracts at given articulation levels require that the teacher work year sequence be the same as his or her students?

F. Who will assume responsibility for the managing of a building when the principal vacations, particularly, if it is a single administrator school? Will there be any extra compensation for the person who will assume the responsibility?

G. How will pupil personnel teams such as the school psychologists, social workers, nurses, and speech therapists be assigned to the year-round schools to provide maximum service when the schools are open?

III Curriculum

A. Can the district actually develop and employ non-sequential, ungraded three-, six-, and nine-week courses at all levels and in all subject areas? Are non-sequential courses necessary?

B. Will practical considerations for implementation of three-, six-, and nine-week non-sequential courses require alteration of present course objectives and teaching strategy?

C. Can all areas of study be placed on a continuum of skill development?

D. Will a year-round plan of education bring about expansion of the curriculum and enhance its accessibility to students?

E. Will student selection of curriculum offerings be broadened?

F. Will the opportunity for intersessions with mini-courses satisfy the need students express for more relevance in the curriculum?

G. Will year-round education effect change in curriculum organization in such areas as continuous progress, mini-courses, independent study, open laboratories, contract assignments, resource centers, achievement grouping, multi-aged grouping, multiple in-depth units, and diversification of the extra-curriculum?

IV Advanced Study, Inservice Education for Staff, and Curriculum Writing

A. What effect will year-round education have on established plans for teachers to pursue advanced study and/or recertification?

B. What will be the pattern of induction and orientation of teachers new to the school district?

C. When and how will inservice programs be conducted for teachers in the year-round program?

D. What opportunities can be provided for the involvement of year-round teachers to work on the development and rewriting of curriculum?

V Cost Implications

A. What is the actual cost of building adaptation for year-round operation, such

as air conditioning and building modifications?

B. What is the actual cost of increasing services in such areas as transportation, plant maintenance, food service, instructional support service and utilities?

C. What is the additional wear-and-tear factor on the building, equipment, and supplies?

D. What is the comparison on a cost accounting basis between the school functioning year-round in terms of all routine instructional expenses?

CURRICULUM SUPERVISORS

Dr. John W. Washburn, Jr.
Director of Elementary Instruction
Great Neck Public Schools
Great Neck, New York

School systems all over the country, whether urban, suburban, or rural, have in common the resources of time, people, space, and "things" a community makes available. While these resources may differ in quantity and quality, they are the basic resources all of us, whether curriculum supervisors, teachers, principals, or other personnel, have with which to do our thing--school.

The year-round approach to schooling provides us with a vast array of opportunities (and problems) as we reorganize these resources for the educational needs of our nation's youngsters.

The following are YRE opportunities (problems?):

People - Possibilities for matching the adults and student population for purposeful activity.

Time - Possibilities for creating new family, community, and school affiliations.

Space - Year-round use of "indoor" and "outdoor" space offers new and extended possibilities.

Things - Possibilities for tangibles (curriculum materials, supplies, etc.) and intangibles (hopes, aspirations, renewed energy) to be orchestrated in more productive ways.

Curriculum supervisors should be expected to serve a major role in attending to the following:

1. Promoting cooperation among school personnel (people resource) to insure that every child has equal access to <u>educational</u> opportunity.

2. Providing <u>services</u> to meet the needs of individual learners in new and expanded ways.

3. Promoting cooperation among all agencies, public and private, that serve the needs of children so that the full array of services and opportunities to meet each child's needs be made available.

Broad curricular areas worth exploring (for YRE and others) are: nutrition education, physical education, moral and ethical education, education for leisure-time pursuits, and education for livelihood.

Mrs. Muriel Brainard
Elementary Language Arts Resource Specialist
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

As I have spoken with teachers and principals about the most important role or roles of curriculum supervisors in year-round education they have consistently said three things: Be available; Be supportive; Know about us.

I would also add two other essential roles assumed by the curriculum supervisor in working with schools dealing with year-round education. These are: Help plan; Communicate.

These are activities, hopefully, that we are already doing for schools on the traditional schedule. What, then, do year-round educators in our various districts mean when they say, be available, be supportive, and know about us?

Our relationship with year-round schools must begin with the KNOW ABOUT US directive. We cannot wait for someone to tell us everything we need to know about year-round education. We must seek that knowledge. We must read. We must listen. We must become involved. We must share ownership of year-round education with teachers and principals. We cannot wait for messages to come to us. We must seek information and be constantly aware of the scheduling of our year-round schools and their specific beginning and ending dates for the various sessions.

Availability and support are the next essential ingredients. Year-round schools need to know you are there and can be called upon at any time. Yet, you must not wait to be invited. You must, at times, anticipate the needs and concerns of year-round schools and become involved. As year-round education implementation begins it is a time when curriculum supervisors must be even more willing to share of themselves, their time, and their talents to help schools make the best instructional decisions and to feel comfortable and knowledgeable in the implementation of those decisions.

Good planning is a key ingredient that can be guided by the curriculum specialist. You must know the year-round situation and then be able to adapt the curriculum to the long- and short-range plans of a school. An essential role of the curriculum specialist will be that of helping school personnel look at the educational process.

Year-round education will stimulate individualized instruction as well as team teaching and multi-aged grouping. The greatest strength of year-round education will be in its flexibility and the potential to meet various needs through many differing implementation plans. The move toward individualization will require careful record-keeping and development of a sequential and continuous progress curriculum. The nature of this curriculum must offer much flexibility. Ideas must be generated and developed by teachers. Curriculum supervisors must have the background and knowledge to become facilitators for this program change growing out of teacher concerns.

There is also the danger that too many changes can come too fast. Curriculum personnel must understand and accept this. If we believe students have differing abilities we must recognize this about teachers and principals as well. Curriculum personnel must be flexible and accepting in their work with schools.

Good communication is always complex. This is even more true in year-round education. At the same time, effective communication is more essential than ever before. In year-round education there is no beginning and no ending of school. New teachers might join a school staff at any time of year. As this happens, curriculum supervisors need to communicate with supportive contact and inservice opportunities.

Communication between groups of teachers who function at different times of the year is important in order that continuous progress can take place. Schools within a district who are operating with year-round education should also have an opportunity to work together. Curriculum supervisors can serve as facilitators to help these communicative opportunities happen.

Thus, the effective year-round education curriculum supervisor must be an individual who has a good basic knowledge of year-round education and who can function as an available support agent to help schools plan and communicate.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Ms. Chris Short
Teacher
Mollala Grade School
Mollala, Oregon

One feels like a journalist as the questions come. What's it like to go in the summer? Is moving a problem? What about continued education for teachers? Is there greater retention with shorter breaks? It became obvious that organizing the responses in some slick expository form would be too time consuming and unnecessary. So what follows is a brief description of the responses to major aspects of the 45-15 year-round schedule as we experienced them.

Instruction: Our 45-15 plan provides a shortened time schedule for lesson sequences. Teachers now think in time periods of three, six or nine weeks in preparing units and their sequence of skills. The short-term goals become necessary as each track proceeds independently throughout the year. Teachers feel a definite need to accomplish certain goals within a specific number of weeks. It might in reality be little different from a traditional system, but our staff feels as though the accountability has risen with the shorter periods of in-school time. It could also be a phase of adjustment we are still experiencing. In either case, it does stimulate teachers to evaluate their sequence of units and goals for each session more critically.

As for the students, learning has never been painless. We have performed no miracles here. But there is a definite relaxed attitude among students because they know a break is within a reasonable length of time. We avoid that extreme tenseness that schools experience each spring during the last month of school.

Another positive aspect is the students attitude upon each return. It's like the beginning of school all over again. Eagerness to be back, to do well, to please is demonstrated four times each year - not just one. This enthusiasm can last up to two weeks - time enough to launch a good nine-week period.

Retention loss is less with three-week breaks. This combined with the students' eagerness stimulates progress with most students. Their self-confidence seems somehow heightened by the perspective they acquire in those three weeks.

Many of the fifth through eighth graders return during their break to help in primary and intermediate classrooms. It becomes a way to stay "where the action is" as well as contribute in a meaningful way - something kids need to experience more during the junior high years. The practice has proved a valuable asset in primary and intermediate classrooms and is often continued when the older students return from vacation.

Observation and Evaluations: Once a year evaluations are required by law. In our system, the principals do this. The number of teachers plus their other responsibilities (discipline and counseling) make the task enormous. The situation simply demands additional personnel, otherwise, we run the risk of "burning out" our principals. A counselor and/or a curriculum coordinator are possibilities for the future.

Parent-Teacher-Student Conferences: This year we have come up with a satisfactory conference schedule. One follows the first nine-week period, and the other follows the third period. During conference week, school is dismissed early. This week is also moving time, and the early dismissal is helpful.

We feel that this is an adequate timetable in which to bring up any concerns, work on them, and evaluate the progress with the majority of students. Special problems are of course handled independently of the general conference schedule.

Conferences are sequentially scheduled for a family with several children. An organizational task we find frustrating at best. One evening is scheduled to accommodate working parents. It is quite successful even though it becomes a long day for teachers.

Further Schooling: Further schooling is limited because of obvious schedule conflicts. Two tracks offer convenient breaks for taking summer school classes and workshops. The district currently has a policy allowing one unpaid term of absence to pursue schooling. No tenure is required to benefit from this arrangement. After five years in the district a year's leave is offered for schooling or travel--unpaid of course.

Oregon College of Education at Monmouth is cooperating during the summer by offering three-week workshops. Perhaps more colleges will modify their summer programs toward this end. Until that becomes a reality, night classes will remain the most common way to pursue post graduate work.

Moving and Storage: Perhaps the most verbalized aspect of YRE is the constant moving between rooms. It is easily the most inconvenient aspect. Temporary storage containers are necessary. Ours were poorly designed--a result of no teacher input as to our needs. They are also communal. Each track only has one--not each teacher.

There was much lamenting in the intermediate and primary levels because of the large store of personal materials to be moved. The problems are being handled by sharing more things and simply streamlining one's mode of instruction--not necessarily at the expense of quality.

The actual process of moving out is done during the normal school day with everyone's help. In some cases only 20 minutes of the student's instruction time is needed.

Moving in is accomplished after school and may take several hours or in some cases a week to get fully set up.

Who one follows and what his or her instructional style is becomes very important. Problems still exist but, like the British, we seem to muddle through.

Vacation Schedules and Tracking: Vacation and track schedules are adjusted once a year. Parents have the option to change. Teachers at each grade level and subject matter area are allowed to work out changes among themselves -- a happy situation for us and the administrators.

The distribution of students among the tracks is relatively even.

After the first year of 45-15, most teachers and parents had definite ideas as to why their particular schedule was just great for them. As a consequence, few changes are made. But like in most situations the administrators and seniority cast the deciding votes in a deadlocked situation.

Community Relations: The weakest aspect of our system is in community relations. At present we have no regular communication with the community. Our only contact with parents is during conferencing and any such notices that are sent with the students. Good PR is essential to a vital school program. It would be to our advantage to develop a regular communication with the community, not only to enhance support of school programming and budgets but also to increase community identity.

We find the 45-15 plan accommodating many of our needs but presenting us with ample opportunities to say, "We sure have a lot of improving to do."

Mrs. Ruth Womack
Principal of Julie Penrose Elementary School
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

In Penrose School, Colorado Springs School District No. 11, Concept 6 was begun because of an overcrowding situation. Concept 6 has allowed us to handle 1,050 students in a school built for 750.

It has been necessary to do more detailed planning administratively because a Concept 6 school is comparable to running three schools in one. The staff has also found it necessary to plan in detail so that all possible teaming is charted well in advance.

Communication is probably the single most important aspect and must be considered from the viewpoint of community, parents, teachers, and students. Communication with parents and community has been done in a variety of ways, including coffees, large open meetings, PTA meetings, curriculum coffees, open houses, and parent-teacher conferences.

Communication with teachers is accomplished with total faculty meetings when possible and with level coordinator meetings and team meetings held weekly.

Student communication is facilitated through opening exercises held each morning for the entire student body in the resource center. This enhances the feeling of a total school awareness rather than a pattern identity. Grouping for the social studies, science, health, and art areas across patterns also makes for a feeling of school unity. Students also observe Track and Field Day, Christmas, Valentine, and Halloween parties throughout the year. Parent-teacher conferences, as well as personal notes from teachers to students are used.

Mrs. Dottie Brenner
Teacher at Vanderhoof Elementary School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

Year-round education has presented to educators in Jefferson County School District one of the most challenging aspects of modern education. Our district, long known for innovations, flexibility and versatility has attempted to put together a sound cohesive year-round education program that will meet the needs of K-12. It is presently being piloted in the Arvada West and Columbine areas.

Our year-round education program, known as Concept 6, divides the calendar into six terms, with four of those equaling a normal or traditional school year. Students may opt for a fifth term. (The fifth term is more remedial on the elementary level and more enrichment or an opportunity to graduate early on the secondary level.)

These terms are designated as Track A, B, and C.

A - October 1 - February 9 April 6 - July 5	B - June 3 - October 2 December 2 - April 7	C - July 31 - December 3 February 6 - June 4

Scheduling perhaps has been our most time-consuming ogre. While there was little difficulty in the buildings in the selection of vacation patterns for the teachers, the opposite holds true for scheduling curriculum; (i.e., social studies, science, language arts, art, music and gym). This problem was made complex by our not having specific teachers assigned to Track B.

Initially, as a staff we had many staff meetings to look at Concept 6 student enrollment in our building. Once numbers were fairly well established, we tackled the dilemma of Track B. This problem has become a focal point upon which all problems revert to--an area of much concern to the teachers and administrators piloting the program. This leads to the observation that if one chooses to have volunteer enrollment in a year-round education program, there must be monies

allocated to cover necessary expenses. Otherwise vacation selection must be mandatory.

The time and effort we have all put into scheduling has been timeless. We now face a new series of planning, evaluation and change due to our enrollment decrease. However, the many rewards throughout our short duration on the pilot have made the effort worthwhile. The children retain far more than they did while on a traditional calendar year. Their attitude is positive and exciting and our "bonus learning sessions" have added yet another dimension in their educational process.

In short, year-round education is like teaming and open-space--a great deal more work, time, and effort--but the rewards make it worthwhile.

ROLE OF THE NON-CERTIFICATED PERSON IN A YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Mrs. Luree Wolff
Secretary at Cunningham Elementary School
Cherry Creek School District 5
Denver, Colorado

Non-certificated personnel -- secretaries, clerks and classroom aides -- have a very involved role in the year-round school just as they did in the traditional school. They continue to be responsible for all secretarial and clerical work, but their duties are expanded.

The greatest expansion comes in the public relations role with the community. The secretary and the clerk must be very well informed on all facets of year-round education because they are constantly explaining some aspect of the year-round operation to parents and visitors, either by telephone or in person. Frequently the children will come to the office for information rather than asking the classroom teacher. This role was very important in the initial implementation, and continues to be very time-consuming since our community is very mobile and those new to year-round schools are constantly enrolling.

Aside from the communication involvement in the initial implementation, the office staff also worked with parents and an aide in dividing the community into four geographic areas that would be balanced both by number of students and grade levels within each track. The office staff designed a family census card which was sent to the community and returned to the office. With this card, each child was marked on the map by a pin color-coded for his grade level.

For scheduling purposes these geographical groups were called tracks, A, B, C, and D. Students of each of the four tracks were scheduled to attend school for 45 class days (9 weeks) and then go on vacation for 15 class days (3 weeks). The tracks always stay in the same order of rotation with three tracks in school and one track on vacation.

A master calendar was printed showing each track in a different color. This calendar was designed so that days in school, vacation days, and holidays were indicated for the entire school year for all four tracks. Individual track calendars were printed and given to each family.

The next step was to get all children pre-registered and assigned to a track. Pre-registration packets were sent home with the students and returned to school before classes ended in June. In early July, team leaders from the staff met and assigned children to classes and areas. The office staff assigned children to tracks based on the boundaries that had been decided by the community group.

Also during July, the secretary and clerk pinned a second map for transportation personnel. A route supervisor spent several days at Cunningham laying out bus routes and stops to accommodate the four tracks. By August 1, registration packets were ready to be mailed to parents. They included individual track calendars, class assignments, and bus stop information. Classes for Colorado's first Year-Round School began September 5, 1972. We still use the same registration

procedure -- pre-registration in May and track calendars, class assignments and bus stops delivered to parents before the new school year begins in July.

As we moved into our first year of the year-round school calendar, our first concern was how to record student attendance in our building and report it to the district office so that the attendance reports to the state included children on all four tracks. We do this by recording attendance by track and grade or level in our attendance books. Then, we report the attendance of students for three tracks at a given time and for the fourth track three weeks later when they return from vacation for a composite attendance number to be reported to the state.

A secretary and clerk in another year-round school in Cherry Creek, in their second year of the 45-15 calendar, devised a track attendance card for each student. This is definitely an improvement over the attendance books Cunningham presently uses. This attendance card will be used by all three elementary schools on the year-round calendar in Cherry Creek next year.

A form with the expected return date is sent home with each student going "off track" reminding parents their children are to return to school three weeks later. These forms are made up in the office and prepared by aides in the instructional areas. Even though this is an added chore, it is especially helpful for parents of new students.

The office types a Parent-Teacher bulletin that is sent home with all students in school the day before a track leaves for vacation -- tracks usually end on a Friday. The bulletin is sent home with the incoming track on the day they return from vacation -- usually a Monday. This same routine is used for sending all types of school information home to parents.

On-going communication with parents continues to be a major role played by clerical personnel. The mobility of the student population at Cunningham places an increased responsibility on both the secretary and the clerk to explain the 45-15 concept to parents new to the community. We have had 200 new students and 190 withdrawals since August 5, 1974.

Teachers and aides may choose from a variety of contractual options and must have individual calendars marked before contracts can be written in the district personnel office. These calendars are marked by teachers and aides and given to the secretary. Each calendar must be checked for accuracy, copied for the office file and forwarded to the personnel office. This additional responsibility is not a function of the traditional school secretarial role. Any changes made during the year requires that the whole process be repeated. School clerks and secretaries in a 45-15 year-round school work 12-month assignments with scheduled vacations.

Mrs. Donna Gerboth
Secretary at Arvada West High School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada West High School
Arvada, Colorado

Concept 6 year-round school has a pattern in which students are in three tracks going to school four quarters out of six. Vacation patterns for each track are at opposite ends of the calendar, with the result of approximately 1/3 fewer students in school at any one time. After official acceptance of the Concept 6 plan of year-round school was given by the Jefferson County Board of Education, secretaries worked along with administrators in preparing family intent forms on the track they would choose. (Each family in Jefferson County Concept 6 schools was given a choice of track which created problems of unequal quarter enrollments from the start of the program.) When the intent forms were gathered and tracks tabulated, students then had to make a choice of courses for four quarters in order for master schedules to be built by the department chairmen.

Teachers at Arvada West High School had been working for several years in preparing their courses to be taught in quarter segments, each course with a title and description. It then became a secretary's responsibility to arrange these listings and descriptions in booklet form

for distribution to every student. This involved considerably more courses than in previous years, and we found ourselves with over 300 courses offered. Tabulating the courses has been a considerable task, but each department had to know how many students to expect in each quarter of the six. A new master schedule must be set up each quarter. These are made available to all teachers and to the administration.

Communications to the parent and student has been of an urgent nature. Prior to each registration, material must be sent to each family, so the student will know just what courses will be offered and when. It has been important for the parents to understand the procedures and changes made under Concept 6. For several years, students have been on a college-type schedule in which they chose their own courses from those which were being offered and had the available space. Secretaries have worked closely with administrators to understand each step, so that all could be accomplished.

Records must be kept of the teacher days used for mini-courses and of the tracks each teacher will be in school. Secretaries, administrators, counselors, and librarians are taking their vacation days throughout the year. A record must be kept individually of these days by the secretary in charge of payroll. Registration for classes, collection of fees, and student schedules require new records being kept for each quarter. Knowing when a student is in or out of school and the track he is on has been a responsibility of secretaries. One of the most important added tasks has been the maintaining of student records, so it can be determined how many credits a student has acquired and when he is eligible for graduation. Arvada West High School will have two graduation ceremonies this year--one on April 10 and another on June 6. A procedure for evaluating Concept 6 in different areas has also been established. This requires extra record-keeping and forms to be filled out at the end of each quarter.

A new system always brings with it new problems, and year-round schools are no exception. Because school is on a continuing basis, the procedure for ordering supplies and books has been changed, and much has been done on the "trial and error" basis this first year. We feel confident the second year will be much less painful in accomplishing the needs of the school as they arise. Also, teachers' qualifications are checked, and rosters are made of subjects each are allowed to teach under North Central accreditation. This is necessary so the principal will know who he can use to teach in another department when the need arises.

Since teachers only meet students 172 days in regular classes, an adjustment of days, as required by the Board of Education, is being channeled into mini-courses. Teachers are involved with these mini-courses for one week of each vacation period, and the courses offered to students who are on similar vacation patterns. A mini-course catalog was prepared, listing courses for credit and non-credit and given out to students, so they could take advantage of these enrichment or remedial courses. The courses offered have been quite extensive and beneficial to students.

Secretaries in the schools in Jefferson County work 205 days a year. The time has not been lengthened for year-round school, so their days have to be coordinated in order to have all work covered all year. This has created some problems in getting the work accomplished. Coordination of many areas of work has to be done, i.e., mailboxes (who is here and who is not), scheduling evaluation time for teachers, maintaining sponsorship of clubs, changing department chairmen, music concerts each quarter, and students scheduled into classes on their off-quarter.

Custodians have had to adjust their work year. Rooms must be thoroughly cleaned during the light enrollment quarter, or a class is asked to move outdoors for a couple of days during nice weather.

Mrs. Nancy Klein
Teacher Aide at Russell Junior High School
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

A paraprofessional has the option of either working four sessions with two eight-week vacations, taken separately, or six sessions with two weeks' vacation. Working days are based

on the total number of days each session must contain to meet the total number of days a student must attend school A teacher aide works through the three-day weekends and spring break. Normally, the two weeks at Christmas are cut short by one to two days. I opted to go year-round, and I have ten days of vacation which can be taken after June 1, the starting date of my contract.

The duties of a junior high year-round paraprofessional are not any different than those of a traditional paraprofessional, except that I go through the beginning and end of the session six times instead of once or twice a year as I would in a traditional school. I am a science teacher aide, and this means chemicals, equipment, books, and new curriculum must be resupplied every session.

Twice a month we have release days where the periods are cut short and school is dismissed by 1:00 p.m. This gives us time to get all the necessary materials ready for the up-coming session. Once a year in February we order all the equipment, chemicals, and books that we will need for the entire 12 months. Paper, pencils, tape, etc., are items that present no problem because they can be ordered weekly from the school warehouse.

The science department has developed a filing system that enables it to keep a continuous report on each student. These filed index cards contain student's vital statistics as well as information on the session he was in school, the science course he is taking, his grades, and his teachers. As a classroom aide, I teach the same subject at least twice a year. It is possible to ready yourself for the second session by doubling the amount of equipment you will need during the first session. When you teach the same subject within two sessions, you are able to iron out all the bugs within a five-month period.

At any given time, you may have to aid an intersession, post-session or presession. These post- and presessions are offered every session, while the intersessions are offered in the middle of a session if the teacher requests such an arrangement. These sessions offer students a wide range of topics to choose from, like a camping trip to the Sand Dunes or a math-help group which I taught during a post-session.

Parent Involvement in the Year-Round School Concept

Mrs. Syd Joseph
President
Colorado Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.
Denver, Colorado

The year-round school is not a new idea in education. Attempts to start them began in the early 1800's in cities like New York and Chicago to help non-English speaking immigrants in their studies by lengthening their instructional year.

In the "good old days" life was simpler; school structures and school schedules were simple too. They seemed to answer all the needs of the children of that day; they didn't have to deal with our changing society or even have to prepare for it.

Today, the pace of change is great - new instructional methods are continually being introduced into the classroom: innovations are taking place everywhere but in the school scheduling. Most children still attend school according to a pattern based on agricultural work habits - fall, winter, and spring; Monday through Friday, for a set time each day.

A baby born 70 years ago is hardly recognizable as the senior citizen of today. As a child grows and changes, so does the society in which he lives. It is reasonable to presume that that child would be more comfortable, happier, and closer to fulfillment of potential if his progress and growth kept up with society and its technology. But it isn't working that way.

Many individuals feel that one of the ways to keep up with the changing times is to throw

away the stereo-type school with the stereotype classroom and give children, during their formal years of education, a broader exposure to fields of study; to increase career education and to work with children so that they can make purposeful use of their leisure time in later years.

Parents are becoming aware of the need for increased quality in education and the equality of educational opportunities, and as we discover these individual needs in learning, the more we are asking for the school systems to provide flexibility in the school program in terms of curriculum content, instructional process, place of study, and better use of time. And time is where parents and teachers get frustrated. Until we can correlate the use of time of the students in the school to the corresponding changes in the life styles of our society, brought about by technilogical change and social needs, we will face the pros and cons of the need to change the concept of the school year and the tradition of time.

The skyrocketing school costs, rising enrollments, increased taxpayer resistance to proposed school bond issues and public criticism of the educational system is beginning to force some school boards and administrators to explore and experiment with year-round plans. There are parents and teachers who are pleased with the plans; there are parents and teachers who are reluctant to cooperate in impiementing the plans.

It takes careful advanced planning, thoughtful administrators, and frequent communication among the administrators, teachers, parent and students to make a year-round plan work.

John McLain in his book, YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION, states, "Our society has become lock stepped and stereotyped in our thinking about the use of time. Our lock-stepped schedules of our children in school prevent us from thinking creatively about how to apply time as a commodity to deal with many of our societal problems; changes in our time schedules and life styles can save our society and billions of dollars a year and help solve basic social and environmental problems in ways that money cannot buy. The time is now and the time and the place to begin is the school."

Pros and cons of parents in year-round school.

1. Parents should be involved from the time first thoughts are given to the year-round school.
2. Parents should be presented all plans to help make choice of plans to use.
3. Students should be informed of plan.
4. All plans or tracks should be thoroughly explained to students and parents -- even walked through the tracks.
5. Students and parents should understand YRS; too much misinformation is given out about YRS by parents and students who only know parts of the program.
6. Students should be on speakers bureau to help sell the YRS story.
7. There should be continuous participation on parent-student projects in order to see that the work does not get lost during the summer.

Mrs. Janet Tczap
Parent
Jefferson County, Colorado

Many areas of Jefferson County are experiencing rapid growth. In order to house the influx of students, we had several options available: double sessions; busing; passing large bond issues, adopting a YRE plan. It is important that alternatives are studied, priorities determined, and then decisions made.

When originally studying YRE plans, several considerations were of top priority: K-12 program; family unity; release of 33-1/3 of student enrollment. For these reasons, Jefferson County designed a plan to fit its areas needs.

A year after implementation of our Concept 6 plan, several pros and cons became obvious. The pros are: "bonus learning sessions"; multiple entry dates for kindergarten; greater opportunities for accelerated and remedial programs; fifth quarter classes; less learning loss; no "end of school" syndrome; fewer retentions; less overcrowding. The cons are: break with tradition; special education classes not available to all tracks.

Parent involvement is a must. It is of paramount importance to the success of any YRE plan that the school district has informed, responsible citizens and parents involved in all stages--planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Thom Foulks
Parent and
County Commissioner of El Paso County
Colorado Springs, Colorado

In 1968, the four Foulks children were among 1,400 children attending an elementary school whose central plant had been designed for 650 children and was surrounded by portable classrooms. The school had a complex schedule which combined elements of extended-day, split-session and divided-day modes with three-day-a-week classes for some subjects. A television news documentary on overcrowded schools centered its attention on the school, showing "The Bulge in the Schoolhouse Door."

The attention gave public impetus to construction bond issues for new school construction in northeast Colorado Springs, prime impact area of the 1966-72 growth which saw the city labeled as the seventh-fastest growing urban area in the Nation.

The same "bulge" in student population kept moving ahead, however, carrying the Foulks children with it. The peak, for them, came with Tom, Jr., being bused more than eight miles to a senior high school, Kathy and Joe enrolled in the year-round pilot program junior high school, and Danny walking only three blocks to one of the traditional-schedule elementary schools built by one of the bond issues. The family missed its usual summer vacation one year because of the difficulty of meshing school schedules into the family schedule, along with the job schedules of both parents.

Another television news documentary, "Year-Round School: The Answer?" filmed around the 1972 Fourth National Seminar on Year-Round Education in San Diego, was widely shown in the Colorado Springs area on television and before civic groups. It helped pave the way for acceptance of the concept.

Kathy, still facing a high school change, has decided she likes the year-round schedule. Joe will not have known anything else since leaving elementary school, and he has benefited academically by continuing classroom work through one of his vacation periods. Danny, still on a traditional schedule, is mentally prepared for the transition. Tom, Jr., after "stopping-out" for a year, is headed for the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. None seem to have sustained harm to their education from serving as societal guinea pigs in one of the most significant changes in lifestyle any family or community can undergo.

Foulks still supports the year-round concept, strongly advocated in the television programs noted above, both of which he wrote, filmed, and narrated.

The Effect of YRE on the Local Church Program

The Reverend Wesley M. Hansen
Pastor of Littleton Baptist Church
Littleton, Colorado

I. ADVANTAGES it may have:
- A. Would minimize the summer attendance slump;
- B. Could aid the growing church in better space utilization if a certain percentage are away on vacation at a given time;
- C. A winter camping program may be possible at other than the holiday season;
- D. Some churches presently close down in the summertime - YRS may force them to open their doors.

II. PROBLEMS it may present:
- A. Vacation Bible School, traditionally held in the summer, would be wiped out;
- B. Many church emphases such as fall promotion, fall leadership training programs, etc., would have to be restructured;
- C. YRS could contribute to family breakdown by the public school acting more continuously as babysitter;
- D. Could greatly hamper the summer church camping programs; many churches have invested thousands of dollars in camp facilities;
- E. Some Sunday School materials have their series geared to three quarters, and non-series related material is taught in the summer; would require vast expenses in overhaul of material;
- F. When not all districts are on the same program it works havoc with the church program because the church is attended by people of different school districts;
- G. Youth programs (Awana, Boys Brigade, Scouts, etc.) are based on the traditional school system and often do not meet during the summer;
- H. YRS would adversely affect the program of the small church more than that of the large church.

III. RANDOM COMMENTS:
- A. Necessity is the mother of invention; if churches are too rigid to adapt, they may be too dead to be useful;
- B. The economic trend in general, and the gasoline shortage in particular, may cause more stay-at-home vacations, in which case it would be hard to predict the effect of YRS on church attendance;
- C. When a subject is taught is not of so much concern to churches as what is taught; the YRS is of little concern to many churches because they are starting their own schools.

Year-Round School and the Personnel Office

Robert Hampson
Administrative Assistant, Personnel Services
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

When the decision was made to place two of our schools in Colorado Springs on the year-round schedule, the immediate concern for the Personnel Office was staffing the schools. Philosophically, staff members were to be treated in such a way that they would not be penalized in any way for working in the year-round program and by the same token they would not receive special benefits over and above other employees in the traditional program.

We have negotiated agreement with the local teachers association so we met with the association and worked out procedures which both parties felt were fair to all teachers involved. The following procedures were developed:

1. Teachers working more than the traditional 182-day work year would be paid 1/182 of the traditional salary for each day worked.

2. Sick leave would be determined on a pro-rated basis depending on the number of days taught.

3. Teachers under contract for 182 days would not be involuntarily assigned more than 182 days or less than 182 days.

4. The method of payment was to be worked out between the staff of the schools involved and the Payroll Department. Those teachers who begin teaching in the middle of the summer will receive 1/24 of their pay on August 1, 11 equal monthly payments, and 1/24 again the following August 1. Teachers beginning with the September session would be paid in the same manner as traditional teachers.

5. Stipends for extra-curricular duty such as intramurals, band director, etc., would be pro-rated for extra time based on the traditional year stipends.

These are a few of the procedures we more or less negotiated within the framework of the agreement already existing. In addition to items above, we decided to keep our elementary teachers with their group of students. When the students are on vacation, the teacher would also be on vacation. This more or less limited elementary teachers to the same number of days as the traditional year. Junior high teachers would be permitted to work five of the six sessions, approximately 210 days if the scheduling permitted it.

The same procedures for salary, sick leave, etc., apply to building administrators and classified personnel. Principals and assistant principals were assigned 220 work days. Most of the classified were given twelve-month assignments with the same benefits as other twelve-month classified employees. In some instances, extra help could be employed for just one session when needed. This would be true for both certificated and classified employees.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. David J. Parks
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blackburg, Virginia

The purposes of this panel were (1) to review the general process of planning and implementing an evaluation procedure for a year-round program, (2) to examine major controversial issues surrounding the evaluation of year-round programs, (3) to explore ways of collecting data on academic achievement and attitudes, and (4) to discuss ways of reporting results to various publics.

A general model of the process of planning and implementing an evaluation procedure was reviewed. The components of the model included (1) the identification and clarification of the specific objectives of the year-round program, (2) the identification and clarification of the potential side-effects of implementing the program, (3) the selection of specific criterion variables for each identified objective and potential side-effect, (4) the establishment of a level of acceptable performance for each criterion variable, (5) the establishment of a time line for the collection of all data, (6) the establishment and implementation of a plan to gain the support of the people affected by the evaluation plan, (7) the collection of data, and (8) the reporting of data. A set of questions, cited in the Jefferson County, Colorado, evaluation plan, which may be useful in identifying objectives and side-effects was presented and discussed.

The controversial issues section focused upon the political milieu in which evaluators perform and the potential and real impacts of this environment upon the outcomes of the evaluation. The panel cited evaluation reports containing examples of failure to consider negative findings in drawing conclusions, reporting findings unrelated to objectives--reaching for something on which to claim success, selective reporting, and overselling the benefits of programs.

A report on the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University year-round schools attitude project was presented. This project, when completed, will have available for distribution through the National Council on Year-Round Education a battery of instruments to measure the attitudes of teachers, administrators, students, board members, and parents. Each instrument will have been checked for reliability, and evidence of validity will be provided. At present, only the instrument for teachers has been developed. Dr. Paul Rice prepared the instrument by reviewing and combining the commendable aspects of attitude surveys of school districts across the country. The instrument was tested with 545 teachers in 103 year-round schools and was found to measure four attitude constructs: (1) Calendar/Program, (2) Administration, (3) Student Welfare, and (4) Teacher Welfare.

The measurement of attitudes through newspaper analysis was discussed, and a brief review of a study of newspaper clippings on year-round education in California, conducted by David J. and Donald E. Parks, was presented ("The Polarization of YRS Interest Groups in California--The Honeymoon is Over!" (The Year-Rounder, 3 (Winter, 1975), 1-3). Although this unobtrusive method of measuring constituents' attitudes has limitations, the panel felt that it does provide a gross measure of how particular groups of people feel about year-round programs.

The final topic presented by the panel covered the form and content of reports to the various publics interested in year-round programs. The panel indicated that technical reports should be provided to district administrators, teachers, and interested professionals across the country. A less technical descriptive report should also be prepared and made available to parents, students, board members, and interested laymen who request it. This report would present the results of the evaluation using graphs and easy-to-follow narrative. Regardless of the format, the panel agreed that the results should be communicated in an intellectually honest way.

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL AND SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Ray Ball
Commissioner
Colorado High School Activities Association
Aurora, Colorado

There should be no problems connected with interschool activities for schools which choose to use a year-round plan of building use. There are problems, however, created for some of the students who attend these schools.

Interscholastics, and especially athletics, are so traditionally and universally catagorized in "seasons" that it becomes almost impossible to see, as an example, football being played at any time other than in the fall. Not that some seasons cannot be shifted in order to accommodate the year-round school concept, but it appears, at least in the foreseeable future, that only a very small percentage of the high schools in the United States, and certainly in the state, will go to the year-round school.

Therefore, students who wish to participate in selected activities must, if they wish to play interscholastically, choose to attend school when these activities are in progress. Their other choice will be to still participate in these activities during their vacation period, but this choice has many obvious disadvantages and in most cases is not palatable to the student.

The student then, who attends the year-round school, is forced to make some difficult choices, assuming he is allowed to make the choice, or assuming the school plan is flexible enough to allow a choice.

Perhaps, as year-round schools become more numerous , the emphasis of the interscholastic program may be shifted to one of the intramural athletics. In that way, each school could set its own seasons in each sport and control the use of its facilities. Intramurals are a very possible solution in the larger schools, and it does seem to be the large schools which are considering or entering into the year-round school concept.

At this time it appears that traditional interscholastic athletic seasons are firm and will not be changed to accommodate the relatively small percentage of high schools which are looking at or participating in a year-round school concept. Schools which will be on year-round plans will be forced to make some concessions to students who wish to participate in specific activities. Schools will also have to cooperate with certain recreation districts when formulating programs, especially if the school and recreation districts are sharing facilities. Certain rules and regulations relative to individual participation and eligibility may need to be altered slightly.

The transition to the year-round school can be made without much difficulty by the school, but the shift to the year-round school can be traumatic to the student who wishes to be included in athletics or other interschool competition and activities. These students and their problems must be seriously considered before any system chooses to solve their housing problems by keeping their schools open all year.

Board Members Look at the Continuous School Year Plan

James D. Bingle
Former School Board Member
Valley View Public Schools
Plainfield, Illinois
and
Board Member, National Council on Year-Round Education

In the nearly 7 years from development of the concept of the Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan in 1968 and 5 years since its implementation on June 30, 1970, residents of the school district have had numerous excellent opportunities to express their collective displeasure with the changed system if they so desired. For example, in the seven elections for school board members held since the development of 45-15, not a single anti 45-15 candidate has even run, let alone been victorious. (In fact, in the crucial 1970 election, the incumbent school board members ran unopposed, an unprecedented situation in the Valley View district.) Perhaps the reason for this is that public opinion surveys have consistently shown that the 45-15 plan has an over 80 percent support level in the Valley View community. In addition, several large school referenda have been successfully passed in the district. Although the referenda were only peripherally related to 45-15, unhappiness with the 45-15 plan would certainly have been shown by a negative vote, since this is traditionally the way the public expresses its feeling on any issue.

Thus we see that year-round education does not have to be a controversial issue but, with the right approach, can become an accepted way of life. Although 45-15 was designed for just one particular school district, there is no doubt that it has applicability for other districts as well. At the present time over 50 school districts around the country have implemented this plan, the most widely accepted form of year-round education.

As a former school board member, I would offer a few words of advice to those who would consider it elsewhere:

1. Allow plenty of time. At least one and perhaps two years should be allowed from the first consideration of the plan until its implementation. There are <u>many</u> details, each of which <u>must</u> be resolved before that first day of school under the new system.

2. Let the community help you make the decision. Go to the public with the alternatives, which are usually: costly building programs, if you have the bonding power; double sessions;

50 or more children in a classroom; or some form of year-round schools. You will be surprised how rapidly the community will agree that year-round schools may be the best solution.

3. Don't let your school administration scare you off. In our district, we were and are blessed with an administration that is not afraid of change when change is necessary. But our research has shown that it is often school administrators who have in the past dragged their feet over school calendar reform because it will mean much work and effort on their part.

4. Involve your teachers. Year-round school will be a big change in their lives and yet it promises to be of great financial benefit to them. Let teachers participate in the planning and scheduling; in fact, insist on it.

5. Keep the public informed. Once you decide to adopt a year-round school system, don't stop communicating. Let everyone know as each step down the road is taken towards that first day of school. It is of vital importance to retain the confidence of the public.

Certainly, the transition to year-round schools in the Valley View District was not perfect, and yet it was smoother than most of us thought possible. We feel that the transition was accomplished so satisfactorily because it was a team effort -- board administration, teachers, and public -- all working together for the good of the children. That is the only way it can succeed.

John L. Wiman
President of board of Education
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Colorado Springs School District 11 has a K-12 program. It is currently a district of 50 schools (35 grade schools, 10 junior high schools, and 5 high schools) with some 35,000 children. The latest additions are a senior high and a junior high just being completed and to be opened in the fall of 1975.

My experience with year-round schools began several years ago with a curiosity as to why school buildings were not used on a 12-month basis. I attended a number of regional and national meetings on the subject of year-round schools. The one common element to be found in every success story was a PROBLEM which had to be solved. Every school system that had any success in breaking out of traditional scheduling and going to a year-round basis was faced with a severe problem such as overcrowding, financing, immediate shortage of new school buildings or something similar. In addition, each successful district had done a far-above-average job in public relations with its community regarding the specific problem or problems and also had done its homework regarding staff enthusiasm for a change to year-round schools.

It became increasingly apparent to our board and administration that the growth in one portion of our district was outstripping our ability to build new schools. A decision was made that year-round schools or one of the traditional alternatives such as busing, double sessions, or extended sessions would be necessary.

Our, then, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Calvin Frazier, undertook the responsibility to oversee and coordinate the selection of principals who in turn worked with him among the total staff to build understanding and enthusiasm for staffing the schools which would be changed. Our board was fortunate in having personnel who accepted this job readily and carried it out most successfully. Dr. Frazier, and those who worked with him, spent many hours, in fact many months, working with the part of the community that would be affected, in explaining the year-round concept and comparing the pros and cons to the other traditional solutions. It would be difficult to overemphasize the need for a strong public relations effort so that the families and children to be involved would have a positive attitude toward year-round scheduling.

The initial two-year trial period is nearly completed and, to date, has certainly been a success in our district. The most common complaint comes from families who have one child in a

year-round school and another child at a different school level in a traditional schedule. Another objection concerns the fact that many companies and the Federal Government often transfer employees during the summer months. This could be in the middle of a school year for a student on the year-round schedule.

Our board was again faced with a need for a decision this spring with regard to the same rapidly growing area of the district. We had to decide whether to keep the two schools in question on the year-round basis and add additional schools to this plan or to do extensive busing or possibly go to split sessions. The decision was made to add three more elementary schools and a new junior high school to the year-round concept. The new senior high will be phased in two years from now. The senior high school was not added at the present time because the board chose to allow the juniors and seniors now in other high schools to have an option of whether to remain where they are or go to the new high school. Thus the new school will not have enough students for year-round scheduling for a couple of years.

School Business Managers in a Year-Round School

Ronald N. Strahanoski
Business Administrator
Valley View Community Unit School District
Bolingbrook-Romeoville, Illinois

Year-round school immediately conjectures in the mind of business managers or fiscal coordinators:

1. What does it cost?
2. What are the financial obligations?
3. How much work is involved for the business manager?
4. What does it do to cash flow?
5. What are the ramifications for business offices?

We will attempt during this session to answer such questions as posed above. We will consider the payroll operations of the year-round school. Discussion will be based upon actual experiences and will deal with a functional approach rather than the theory approach.

Year-round school and the business official sometimes are in conflict. Although most business officials work the year-round, the traditional school attendance plan did allow for some breathing space during the summer months. There was time, seemingly, to collect the so-called "wits" of those in the business office, do some planning for the coming school year, do the ordering, and get the old year cleaned up and out of the way.

Year-round school finds the business office constantly engulfed in full activities, e.g., the ordering for a new year begins several months before the old year is over. Thus, two years are going on at the same time, two budgets co-existing. This may not be a problem with a small school district, but for one of substantial size it does cause a greater work load.

Fiscal coordinators may question the feasibility of operating two budget years at the same time. Nevertheless, year-round school soon becomes a habit for the business official. The business official adapts, rather rapidly, to the year-round mode of operation. In fact, year-round business operations become quite similar to every-day operations of the business world.

Cash flow becomes a serious problem when the school year begins, in full force, July 1. Such problems as tax distribution and state aid do not always begin flowing in the months of July and August. Tax anticipation warrants or notes could be a necessary evil to cover cash flow problems.

Year-round school and school business officials, in summary, are compatible with the everyday life of the business world. Year-round business activities simply mean a business manager has to better plan his own activities and the activities of the business office. Practical experience of year-round schools indicates "more can be done if one knows each day has to be accounted for in full." The nine-month syndrome vanishes once the full-year is in existence. The work day, month, year, soon becomes routine.

The transition from a traditional school year to the year-round school becomes easier today due to the fact that many schools are switching over. Thus, there is more information available, as through this conference, for the business operations personnel.

School District Superintendents

Dr. Gene Henderson
Superintendent of Francis Howell School District
St. Charles, Missouri
and
Board Member, National Council on Year-Round Education

The implementation and operation of year-round programs is an exciting and challenging responsibility for superintendents. School districts continue to jump in and jump out of various kinds of year-round calendars. The administrative man-hours, the grief and sorrow, and the satisfactions of bringing a community to think about practical and superior alternatives to that old warhorse, the nine-month schedule, are worth their price. No one of the new schedules is right for every community, just as the nine-month schedule is not right for every community. The movement to date would indicate that the future holds more and more variation from the traditions of the past in calendaring.

All superintendents involved in calendar changes probably agree that the work load involved is greatly increased over the traditional schedule. Planning assumes an even larger role and it is necessary to beat out the nine-month thinking to avoid planning errors. The financial implications have to be closely monitored. Every change brings opposition from each of the school publics. And since all superintendents are looking for ways to improve learning, there is the constant search for "hard data" upon which to base decisions for the future.

Communication among administrators is very helpful since the search for improvement is common to all. The National Council on Year-Round Education serves superintendents well in this capacity. The annual gathering of thinking from the Nation is supplemented throughout the year by Council publications. Perhaps the Council will become more and more important as the dearth of travel funds limits the visits to operational year-round programs by representatives from districts involved in feasibility studies.

School Public Relations Personnel

Dr. Ernest H. Mueller
Superintendent of Pennsbury School District
Fallsington, Pennsylvania
and
Board Member, National Council on Year-Round Education

Forming the communications team: How do you do it? What form should it take? What staff training is required? How do you know if it's working?

Information dissemination: What information should be disseminated? Who should disseminate it? How should it be disseminated (technique)? Timing--when should it be disseminated? How do you bring all elements along at the same pace (staff, students, community, school board, legislators, press, etc.)?

Decentralizing P.R. responsibilities: Who should be responsible for what? How can you insure against the spread of misinformation?

How do you determine?: Whom you are listening to? Whom should you listen to? What are your publics saying? What are your publics hearing?

How do you train people to the no sell, no panacea approach?

Applying the "controlled brinkmanship" approach to P.R. and information dissemination: Sensitizing staff, students, community to a need; adequate information dissemination to produce positive action to implement the change and adequate information as to its actual implementation and its impact.

Why have public relations? Do you have a choice? These questions are frequently asked but they have no foundation in logic. There is no choice as to whether you will or will not have public relations. The only choice available is whether you will have good or bad public relations. Each day in each way that you act or do not act, you are developing a public impression which determines your public image and a program of public relations.

Among the requirements of a public relations program are to guage the opinions held by all groups that are significant to you and to place yourselves in harmony with these opinions. If you cannot do the above, you must modify those opinions. To do this, you must have the potential for self-expression--clear, forceful, and continuous.

Some people think that P.R. is made up of the amount of newsprint used. But it really is good will. The impressions made by an institution on its public and the resulting opinion and action of the public constitute its good will.

What factors are involved in the development of good/bad will? There are history, aims, ideals, achievements, failures, services, needs, and plans for the future. All of the above enter into the public's development of an opinion.

History: How did the organization come into existence? Who founded it? What is the value of service performed, etc.?

Aims: There is no substitute for aims. P.R. must have aims to succeed.

Ideals: Give values to purposes. An ideal is an aim that is widely admired. It may not be achieved, but it must be striven for.

Achievements and failures: What the record discloses cannot easily be refuted. "By their works you shall know them" is a time-tested proverb; it is easier to have good P.R. with good works. Mistakes cannot be hidden. They must be accounted for and corrections should be publicized. Although the P.R. program relies greatly on achievements, it is essential that this not be overdone. Allowance for error must be made.

Services and disservices: The task for workers in P.R. is to select with care and insight enough of the desirable services performed by institutions so that an effective and appropriate case can be made to the public. The "why" and "how" of it must be explained along with the "what" of it.

Needs: Organizational needs must be brought to the public's attention if understanding is to be accomplished.

Publicity and press agents: Advertising knowledge of important currents and developments within the field all add to the P.R. program. Don't blow your horn too hard; moderation is best; save some for later; consistency is important. Stay away from the slight-of-hand approach; sincerity, straightforwardness, and honesty, well-packaged, will get you further than all else. P.R.'s main effort should be designed to serve the public with realistic, accurate, fair, honest, responsible, open information. The P.R. man must look for activities and policies in the organization that are socially acceptable and deserving and in the public interest.

How do you test your program? Are the current activities interesting? Informative? Entertaining? Illuminating? Based on facts?

Holding the sustained interest of the public is difficult. Human interest, acts of courage, acts of kindness, outstanding research, etc., are all of public interest.

People like to learn new things, especially about services to them--how the services will help them, reduce their expenses, decrease their labor, etc.

Entertainment breeds good will, and good will is the goal of public relations. Hence, entertainment is good P.R. Use it to the best advantage on the right occasions. Carefully planned and staged entertainment can be illuminating. Any fact or idea can be dull and drab when it lacks the quality of animation. Spice it up in color, hospitality, sociability, uniqueness.

Misconception of public reaction is a common error in public relations. An example of this is that in the early days people refused to buy autos. Manufacturers thought that every one would want an auto regardless of cost and problems. But the public wanted economical transportation--not autos. They stayed with the horse and buggy. Finally the auto industry altered three points in its P.R. program and added: servicing by manufacturers; mass production to reduce costs; sales through installment payments and take-ins.

Successful P.R. programs are never finished; they are a continuing process based on discovery of what is in the public mind and willingness to act upon the information received. An example here is the telephone company. Initially, its personnel were gruff on the phones and provided slow service. They responded to public concerns with the addition of courteous, efficient, young ladies, and telephones were on their way.

Mrs. Joy Christopher
Director, Cherry Creek Demonstration Center for Year-Round Education
and Team Leader, Intermediate Open Space
Cunningham Year-Round Elementary School
Cherry Creek School District 5
Denver, Colorado

Cherry Creek is a suburban school district of about 15,000 students in the southeast section of the Metropolitan Denver area. There are three elementary schools -- a total of about 2000 students -- on the 45-15 calendar. Cunningham implemented Colorado's first year-round school in September 1972. Eastridge became a 45-15 school in July 1973, and Mission Viejo began year-round operation in July 1974. Each decision to change the calendar was made at the school-community level rather than by mandate or suggestion of the administration or Board of Education.

Cherry Creek has no district position for a public relations person, so the job of school-community relations is usually done by principals and teachers within individual schools. With district-wide endeavors, such as a school bond election, an assistant superintendent assumes public relations responsibilities.

Since the original suggestion to implement a year-round calendar in Cherry Creek comes from the school level, principals and teachers go to the community with information about year-round education. Once Cunningham was given permission to implement, a teacher was released half-time from April to June to answer parents' questions about year-round education, both personally and through school communiques.

During the first year of operation the district continued to release the teacher half time to help keep the community and district informed. This was done through publication of brochures, especially good for new parents and visitors; publication of a principal's newsletter; coordinating visits of reporters from the various news media; conducting tours of the building, and explaining operation and program to parents and visitors; and attending neighborhood and track coffees.

When Eastridge went to its community, this teacher helped prepare a brochure for distribution to parents in that community and attended coffees to share the story of year-round school at Cunningham.

Federal funding through an ESEA Title III grant began providing for a half-time person to be director of a Demonstration and Dissemination Center at Cunningham in July 1973 and that has continued. The time has been reduced to one-fourth of a teaching slot in the request for the second year of continuation.

Duties of that job include being a resource to the District Study Committee that is exploring year-round calendars for the secondary level and being a member of the advisory council of parents, teachers and administrators that functions as part of the Title III grant. Requests for information about year-round education in Cherry Creek are channeled through the demonstration center.

Del Harding
Director of Public Information
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

Most of us realize year-round school is controversial. But I, for one, didn't realize the intensity to which some persons would oppose the idea until after we initiated our Concept 6 program in Jefferson County.

Each of you attending this session has been given a 10-page pamphlet of letters to the editor which were run in our local newspapers in recent months. They illustrate dramatically just how strongly some persons object to year-round schools.

It reminds me of the comment one of the Denver newspapers received a few years ago when Congress ordered daylight savings time for the Nation. "They're fooling around with God's time!" one caller protested.

Apparently some persons believe we're fooling around with God's calendar when we institute year-round schools.

No matter how you slice it, after nearly fours years of discussion, the number one objection to year-round schools in our district still seems to be the fact that it violates tradition. Apparently if it is different, it must be bad.

I don't mean to imply Concept 6 doesn't have problems. It does, and we're working to cor-

rect them. I've got two children in Concept 6 schools and there are some aspects of the program I don't like. But Concept 6 is basically a sound program with many advantages.

And fortunately, according to two independently-administered random sample opinion surveys, the majority of citizens in our county support Concept 6. But as is always the case, a few people can make a lot of noise---and write a lot of letters to the editor.

Thurman Warner
Director of Public Information
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

According to the textbooks, careful planning is the key to achieving any public relations objective. When the objective is public acceptance of a year-round school plan, there is another, equally important key--flexibility. This is not to minimize the importance of planning but to point up the fact that no plan is likely to proceed smoothly from one phase to another, moving inexorably to the desired outcome--not when year-round school is the issue.

In Colorado Springs we have twice fought the year-round battle, the first time to implement a year-round program in only two of our fifty schools; the second time to expand it to three more schools. Both times we began with a plan, and both times it was necessary to deviate from it to achieve our objectives.

The need for flexibility arises because of shifts in public opinion and attitudes toward year-round school programs. As people learn more about year-round programs generally and the specific program that is proposed, some who initially support it tend to become indifferent or actively oppose it when they find out it isn't going to cut school district operating costs and in fact may add to those costs to get it started. Other people, especially parents, initially in opposition, become supporters once they learn their children are not going to be in school 12 months every year.

Reinforcing the favorable attitudes of those who support a year-round program and neutralizing the charges of opponents in this kind of dynamic situation requires the flexibility to shift rapidly to different kinds of appeals and information and all of it, perhaps disseminated by different means. I don't believe that any P.R. plan lacking this flexibility can succeed in persuading a community to accept a year-round program.

Secondary School Principals and Teachers

Dr. Daniel Knueppel
Principal of Tenafly High School
Tenafly, New Jersey

How does a principal plan and operate an extended school year program? What are the roles and needs of teachers in an extended school year program? To start with, I will give you a brief insight into my involvement in ESY as it has taken place in a suburb of New York City.

As principal of a school in a community with a high degree of citizen input in the educational process, the idea of extended school year was studied and proposed five years ago. At that time a committee studying long-range goals for the district indicated that a plan should be developed to determine the place ESY would play in a new school under construction. The

building, as it was planned and constructed, was to lend itself to the ESY concept because it was to be air-conditioned, as well as heated, for year-round use.

After the committee had formulated its recommendations, the most critical step in the process was about to begin - ANALYSIS. As an administrator, I knew that I had to assess very carefully the attitudes and needs of the students, staff, and community. I needed to organize a study that would gain as much input from each group as possible. Everyone needed to know the essentials of the various approaches to ESY and to be given the opportunity to react. Several committees and surveys accomplished this goal. I am especially proud of the community survey conducted by a professional pollster, Oliver Quayle. With the use of such expertise, I was able to overcome the usual charge of "fact manipulation." It was my goal to create an atmosphere at this point in the program that gave each contributing individual the feeling that his or her view toward moving in a certain direction was critical in arriving at the final decision. Such active participation within the community makes for a more knowledgeable climate that understands the reasoning behind change.

The next step in the process was DECISION. All the collected data from committees and surveys was to be carefully considered and a decision was to be made as to the appropriate course of action. For our district, it was decided that the program would be of most benefit to students at the high school age level. We were specifically concerned with how it would answer the matters of early graduation, enrichment, and additional flexibility to our curricular offerings. We were not going to introduce the program to save money. The simple purpose of our program was to increase the educational options open to our students who were not benefiting fully from existing patterns.

Once the decision was made, it became necessary to begin PLANNING for implementation. With what we considered a limited but clearly defined goal, it soon became evident that the impact would be enormous. To increase options meant abandoning the traditional year courses and moving to semesters. A total evaluation of our operating program began. To increase options we decided to create a summer semester with variable time patterns.

The major constraint on our program was the fact that it was to be voluntary. The results of our public opinion survey indicated that the community supported the proposed program mainly due to the fact that students would be involved in only those aspects which they individually desired. Throughout the period of study and development, I gave careful attention to the needs of the instructional staff, as well as to the needs of the students. Where changes in curricular program became necessary, adequate procedures for inservice workshops had to be provided. Time and money were the necessary ingredients to accomplish this purpose. The majority of funds expended were in this area. Where patterns of vacation were involved, priority was given to the special request of the teacher. Compensation for work in the newly structured summer semester was drastically altered to encourage staff participation. Throughout this period of planning, assistance from the New Jersey Department of Education under the leadership of Dr. Bruce Campbell provided valuable expertise and funds for the study.

The school year 1974-75 was designated as our initial IMPLEMENTATION period. Our first summer semester started with 25 percent of our student body participating in our newly enriched program. Students, staff, and community felt that a good beginning had been made. As the current school year progresses, additional data for evaluation of the program continues to be gathered.

We are not in our on-going EVALUATION phase. The impact that ESY has had on our curricular program and analysis of it has been phenomenal. It has become apparent that as the program has developed, we have made more effective use of our facilities and equipment in the high school by using them year-round. In addition, the flexibility provided in the summer semester has permitted the school to make use of the New York Theater district to teach drama. Palisades State Park, together with other local nature areas, has been used to teach field geology and field biology. Several municipal and state government facilities are involved in the teaching of government courses and several similar field-related options.

Based upon our present evaluations and plans, Summer Semester 1975 holds great promise. I feel that in large measure our positive venture into the ESY program has been based upon a decision that involved the consensus of many participating individuals and upon a decision that called for a small beginning with limited objectives. To date, that decision has held merit and is working in our community!

Arvel R. Ricketts
Principal of Doherty High School
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

The basic kinds of responsibilities of a principal change very little when planning and implementing a year-round program; however, the time, energy, and resources devoted to some of these responsibilities do increase markedly.

Thorough planning, communicating with parents, students, and central administration personnel, and working with teachers to develop program and operating guidelines, although always important, assume even more significance when a school is undertaking a change as major as year-round school. Consequently, parents were informed and involved through (1) a mass meeting with several hundred parents in our attendance area, (2) thirty-two small group discussion meetings held in homes throughout the area, (3) the Parent Advisory Council, (4) frequent newsletters, and (5) great numbers of individual conferences.

Teachers began their examination of the year-round program in a special faculty meeting which lasted for three hours and was held during regular school hours. As a result of this faculty meeting, committees were formed to study the following: (1) curriculum changes, (2) teacher contract options, (3) teacher pattern choices and priorities, (4) additional support which would be needed if the plan were implemented, (5) student activities, and (6) intersession (instructional programs for students on vacation). After several weeks of committee study another faculty meeting was held to give reports and frame a recommendation to the school board. The above list of activities, which occurred over a two-month period, is representative of what was done, but is by no means a total picture.

Principals in districts contemplating year-round plans may find the following list of advantages and disadvantages of interest. Some items are of a purely personal nature, but it seems appropriate to mention them in the "Job Alike" context.

Advantages of a year-round program are:

1. A year-round program will bring a reduction of student density at any given time usually resulting in fewer discipline problems, more attention to individual students, and better control; this is especially true when compared to an extended day program.

2. Greater options are available for teachers, including a choice between a regular school year contract or a longer contract for more compensation as well as a choice when they would like to take their vacations.

3. Beginning of the year and end of the year problems are substantially reduced since there is never a total opening or closing of school.

4. Instruction is improved since teachers may try instructional techniques, revise them, and try the revision in only two months instead of having to wait an entire year. This is possible because of the staggered starting times of various attendance groups.

5. Administrative staff members can take a Friday or a Monday off as part of their vacations which is not possible under the typical school calendar.

Disadvantages of a year-round program are:

1. Students and staff are virtually always in school requiring constant input and leaving little time for contemplation and unhurried planning.

2. It is difficult for administrative staff members to take vacations of any length and quite a bit of their vacation time seems never to get used.

3. Building a master schedule is a constant activity since it must be changed to some degree every eight weeks. (Concept 6)

4. There could be problems in designating which teachers get preference in the assignment of vacation times; however, this did not occur in our situation since the teachers involved considered one another's needs.

5. The highly mobile population in the area resulted in some people buying homes and then coming to the school to find out it was on a year-round program. In some cases this was a rather traumatic discovery.

6. There is, of course, some robust parental opposition to the year-round school concept.

Ray Schneringer
Assistant Principal of Arvada West Senior High School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

The principle reason for venturing into year-round education was the rapidly increasing enrollment at Arvada West. Charged by a citizens committee in 1970, Dr. William White, then principal at Arvada West, studied various year-round plans and began formulating ideas for a similar operation which would mesh with the curriculum in the school.

A county committee was formed to study the same plan, a year-round program, which would be viewed from a county-wide standpoint.

Dr. White, along with the administrative and teaching staffs, kicked around ideas on quarterizing the entire curriculum, vacation patterns, teacher pupil contact days, and on and on. After a year of planning, the final draft was drawn up and Concept 6 was formed.

We immediately set the wheels in motion preparing for the day when we might be given the opportunity to use this new plan. With the two largest departments already on a quarter system, the rest of the departments began revising the curriculum to work within the nine-week quarter. The physical education department was preparing a co-ed curriculum in order to increase enrollment in that area. The foreign language teachers were enthusiastically writing an individualized program of instruction. The teachers gave of their time unselfishly, using lunch periods, planning periods, and most of their vacations in order to get the job finished.

We actually implemented many of the ideas and programs the year prior to the pilot start-up date. When the board of education decided on the Arvada West area as one of the pilot areas, we were really a year ahead of most of the schools involved. The start-up in August was a smooth one. Unfortunately it didn't begin as easily in every school.

There have been problems arising during this first year. We have been looking at these problems from quarter to quarter and coming up with workable solutions. After one year, the staff honestly feels, that educationally, Concept 6 offers more to students than ever before.

Interest Alike Sessions

Year-Round Schools for the Neophyte

N. B. Triplett
Principal of Mesa Verde High School
Citrus Heights, California

The 45-15 year-round plan I am discussing is a modified version of the original schedule initiated in Valley View School District in Illinois. It is modified in the sense that attendance periods may vary from 43 to 47 days in order to maintain cycles which begin on Mondays and end on Fridays. Essentially, however, students attend school for nine weeks and are on vacation for three weeks, aside from one to two-week break at Christmas and a two-week period in summer when all groups are on vacation. As a result, every student has a three-week vacation during all four seasons of the year as well as the additional breaks during Christmas and summer.

The duration of the school year for students is not extended by this plan. They attend 177 school days - the same as other students who are not on the plan. Their school year is simply distributed more broadly across the calendar year. At any given time three-fourths of the students are attending school while one-fourth are on vacation.

Classroom teachers in this year-round plan will be, for the most part, tracked with their pupils. That is, when the students go on vacation, their teacher also leaves. When they return for their next nine-week attendance period, they are assigned to the same teacher. It is intended that teachers will remain with a group through four nine-week blocks which would be equivalent to a traditional school year.

In order to maintain the same level of auxiliary services to all students, regardless of their particular attendance schedule, it will be necessary to extend contracts of some specialized personnel up to 220 days. In such cases, salary is increased by a per diem amount. Contracts would be extended for some personnel who work on a continuing basis with students: librarians, nurses, speech and hearing specialists, reading specialists, and others. It is not necessary to extend contracts of those who work with students on a periodic basis such as would be the case with psychologists, audiometrists, resource teachers, and others. Special services in the latter categories could simply be redistributed equally throughout the year.

Contracts of year-round school principals would be extended to 12 months from the current 11-month contracts. If the principal of a participating school elects not to have a contract extension, he may have his school covered during his vacation by an ALTP member from within the district. This plan provides an added advantage of providing a practical administration internship to those who aspire to non-classroom positions.

Contracts of school secretaries would be extended unless they have elected to keep their present contract, in which case substitute secretaries would be brought in during vacation periods. Custodial and maintenance services are on a year-round basis already so require no extension of contracts.

The traditional summer school program would be redesigned into Intersessions. Intersession courses are offered continuously during all of the three-week vacation periods. By administrative decision, the California State Department of Education has granted permission to redistribute summer school in this manner and will provide ADA reimbursement at the same level as in the past. Intersession courses are staffed by teachers who are on vacation at a per diem rate.

Great flexibility is encouraged in planning intersession courses. Duration of the courses may be from one to three weeks, and from one to four hours per day, depending upon the nature of the course and the age and interests of the students. Tremendous opportunity is thus available for either remedial or enrichment programs on a continuous basis instead of being limited to the traditional summer period.

As the intersession program develops, we propose to explore a number of exciting possibilities. Cross-age tutoring and individualized contract learning could be implemented. Other possibilities to be explored are courses with a seasonal emphasis utilizing out-of-school recreational facilities and personnel, chaining or linking courses of a related nature through two or several intersession periods and extended travel courses.

Since intersession courses operate concurrently with regular school operation, certain savings accrue to this program which help offset year-round school, i.e., program administrative and clerical costs. That is, while the courses generate ADA reimbursement, no additional administrative or clerical costs are involved.

Available classroom housing space is generated, under the 45-15 plan, through continuous use of existing school facilities. Since we are not implementing this plan due to a lack of classroom facilities, opportunity for free classroom space will be available. These open rooms will allow much-needed space for small group instruction, intersessions, recreational facilities, resource personnel, teaching stations, and special interest centers. This available space may also accommodate a schedule of major maintenance in rooms whose classes are on the three-week vacation.

Early in the planning stages it was determined that community acceptance of the year-round school program might be enhanced if it were possible to offer an option to parents concerning their choice of plan. Parents would be given the option to have their children attend a neighboring school on the traditional plans with bus transportation provided.

Other districts implementing the 45-15 year-round plan have divided their students into tracks according to a geographic area. After considerable study of the advantages and problems with this tracking system, we have elected to track our students according to the individual needs of each student. This process will allow students to be placed in classes according to the ability grouping structure within each classroom.

A 45-15 plan offers students varied attendance pattern options, particularly on the intermediate and high school levels. After initial implementation phases are secure and the structure is operating soundly, a variety of options could be offered students for specific reasons. The amount of flexibility would be determined necessarily by the tracking pattern of the school and the grade level. Thus, after consultation with a parent, the student could have the option to attend school according to his own particular individual or family needs.

In keeping with the continuous education concept inherent in the year-round school program, formalized promotion from grade to grade is minimized. Rather, a continuous flow of pupil development from one attendance block to the next is possible. Many alternatives exist for accelerating or delaying the progress of individual pupils, depending upon their individual needs and capabilities. Individuals may be retained for one or two nine-week attendance periods rather than for a full year as is the case in traditionally organized schools. Students may also be encouraged to pursue individual learning prescriptions during intersession periods in order to achieve remediation of specific learning difficultues. Students may also be moved ahead in small, comfortable increments should their maturity and school progress so indicate.

Care must be exercised, of course, in moving students from one attendance group to another in order to avoid disruption of family plans, loss of school time, frequent change of teachers, etc. However, the potential psychological advantage to pupils of such flexibility in school placement presents one of the more exciting possibilities of the year-round school program.

Dr. William D. White
Director, Instructional Planning and Development
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

When considering a year-round school program for the first time, the planners in a school system should consider the variables which affect the design of the extended school year calendar. There is no one system of year-round education which is desirable for all communities and all

localities. As climates vary and as the social and economic patterns of a community are different one from another, the type of calendar which the school system can best utilize will be different as well. Each school district then is advised to study its own local conditions, look at the ingredients which can be utilized to develop a calendar suited to its particular needs and tailor-make a program that will offer the greatest educational benefits.

The number of attendance terms is a first factor which the planners of a year-round school calendar should consider. School districts traditionally have had two terms or semesters on the nine-month calendar. But in the year-round plan the calendar may be divided into three, four, five, six, or even more attendance terms. The sequential periods of instruction which are most desirable to the staff and community are the necessary criteria for determining the number of attendance terms to be used.

Second, the number of vacations available in the calendar is a variable to consider. Traditionally there has been a single three-month vacation with a number of holidays throughout the year. A year-round school calendar may have two, three, four, or even five vacations during the course of the year.

The third item to consider is the number of holidays that will be observed in the calendar, and this varies from one region to another depending upon the religious, social, and economic background of the community that is involved.

The fourth variable is the number of attendance tracks into which the students will be scheduled. This is a variable which helps to determine economy in a program. The traditional calendar has a single track of students, but two, three, or four different attendance tracks may be used. It should be remembered, however, that the larger the number of attendance tracks the more subdivisions of the student population will be required during any attendance term.

The final variable, the number of students released per vacation, is a dependent variable which is determined by the number of attendance tracks. If there are four tracks, 25 percent of the students can be released to vacations during each season of the year. If there are only three tracks, however, 33 1/3 percent of the students can be released and, therefore, a greater gain in economy can be achieved.

The second set of factors to consider in a year-round school plan are the stipulations which the local school district may place upon its calendar. In the Jefferson County School System it was stipulated that certain conditions would have to be met in the year-round school calendar which would utilize the existing program and preserve a K-12 feeder system. The stipulations were as follows:

1. The year-round school calendar must apply to all students within a feeder system K-12.

2. The calendar must preserve family unity so that all students within a family vacation at the same time.

3. The quality of the educational program in operation at the beginning of the pilot program must continue to be met throughout the pilot stage.

4. Freedom of choice in the selection of vacation patterns must be offered to families.

5. The present curriculum would need to be used during the pilot phase. There were no additional funds available for developing a curricular program to accommodate any newly established year-round operation.

6. The calendar must be flexible for students in order that they receive the amount of education their personal need would require. There would be a minimum school year of 172 days and a maximum school year of up to 235 days.

7. There must be efficient use of buildings. A release of significant portion of the student population during each season of the year is sought in order to gain economy in the use of building space.

An additional set of stipulations observed in the Jefferson County pilot were as follows:

1. The minimum school year that could be observed under Colorado State Law is 172 days.

2. The minimum number of holidays acceptable to the parents in the Jefferson County School System were 11 holidays.

3. The length of the attendance term during which students would pursue a single series of instructional units was 43 days.

4. The length of the basic contract year for teachers was 184 days.

A wide range of year-round school models were studied and evaluated by the Year-Round School Study Committee in Jefferson County. They started with the Four-Quarter plan, the Five-Quarter plan, and the 45-15 Year-Round School Calendar. Each of these programs seemed to have certain merits but also deficiencies which the Jefferson County School teachers and parents felt were undesirable for their purposes. After all the conceivable models of year-round school calendars were studied, the plan which divided the year up into six attendance terms offering each student two vacations during opposite seasons of the year seemed to be most desirable. A primary factor in selecting this plan, called Concept 6, was the fact that 33 1/3 percent of the students could be released to vacations at a time, giving a maximum economy. There was also the fact that there were no staggered entry dates for students during their attendance terms. All programs of instruction going on during any term would have students in the same stage of learning as the programs of instruction were pursued.

Educational benefits which the Concept 6 program seemed to offer were the opportunity for students to attend a fifth term when they desired enrichment or remedial work and the addition of bonus learning sessions or intersessions during vacation times. The bonus learning sessions were seen as one of the strongest features of a year-round school calendar which would allow schools to extend the range of educational opportunities for their boys and girls.

The basic intent of the bonus learning sessions were twofold. First, they would provide an opportunity for youngsters to attend additional periods of education voluntarily during their vacations for the purposes of enrichment, acceleration, or remediation. Secondly, they would provide an opportunity for extending the time the individual student requires for mastery.

The purposes of the bonus learning sessions were to extend to the local school options to the required curriculum. They would permit the local staff the opportunity for intervention in behalf of the students with special needs. Also they would humanize the school through extension of teacher-pupil contacts in a variety of activities appealing to the interests and talents of students.

The development of bonus learning session activities became the responsibility of each individual school. It was the first genuine attempt of each school to develop a program exclusively for its own local community needs. These learning activities were generated through the processes of (1) teacher-student-parent involvement, (2) extensive use of community resources, talent, and space, and (3) the approval of this alternative curriculum was granted through the office of the local principal.

Dr. E. Curtis Henson
Assistant Superintendent for Career Education
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Structurally, the four-quarter program is a division of the school year into four periods of approximately equal length rather than into two semesters and a summer session. To be meaningful, a conscienctious effort must be made to provide a complete program during each quarter and to require only minimum prerequisites and/or sequential offerings so that a pupil may choose to work or go on vacation at a time other than during the summer without undue penalty.

To divide the textbook or course into four quarters instead of two semesters does not produce an adequate four-quarter program. Without extensive revision of educational goals and an intensive analysis of the curriculum, four quarters of school will be no more of an exciting prospect than three quarters or two semesters. Factors other than time, number, and amount of days must be weighed. Each quarter course must be a complete and autonomous unit. The number of

possible courses within a given discipline must be large enough to assure ease in scheduling while assuring continuous growth opportunities for the pupil. Only occasionally would a pupil be required to pass a specific course since there are others which deal with similar concepts of equal quality which would serve as well.

With the four-quarter plan, a system can offer greater flexibility both in scheduling and in curriculum offerings. The possibilities appear unlimited and the benefits to pupils great. If a pupil chooses, he may take a greater number of courses in a twelve-month period. Such a choice permits him these options: He may graduate at an earlier date, enrich his plan of studies, take remedial work if required, or take an alternate course if he is unsuccessful in one. He may work in November on a job he possibly could not have gotten the previous June. He may even work part-time and attend school part-time year-round. To a great extent, he may vary his studies according to interest and convenience as course offerings become less sequential in some subject areas.

For the school system, advantages sought from a four-quarter plan are not financial. Initially, such an operation is more expensive to implement and maintain than the traditional two-semester plus a tuition-supported summer school. Benefits to pupils should be the prime reason for converting to a four-quarter school program.

Martin Rubinstein
Director, Department of Support Programs
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

In Dade County, Florida, it was found that the experiences of other school systems would indicate that the following criteria needed to be considered prior to the development of an extended school year program for the Dade County Schools:

1. The extended school year design that produces the greatest plant utilization benefit requires the greatest adjustment in living patterns and such designs have proved least acceptable to communities at large

2. Extended school year designs that mandate specific vacation periods to pupils are not as acceptable to communities as are those extended school year programs that are voluntary in nature.

3. Extended school year designs that demand a radical departure from existing school calendars are not accepted by communities as well as those extended school year plans that require only slight calendar changes.

4. The extended school year plan that increases the students' options of course selection, attendance sessions and vacation options are more acceptable to students, parents and citizens than those plans which maintain present restrictions in the areas of curriculum, attendance, and vacation periods.

On the basis of the above criteria, the quinmester program was developed in Dade County for piloting in selected secondary schools. The quinmester extended school year design was developed around a calendar that divides the school year into five 45-day or 9-week sessions. Pupils in schools operating with the quinmester program must attend four quinmesters in the five quinmester school year. The student has the option of attending all five quinmesters and accelerating his graduation from high school or electing a vacation quinmester other than the traditional summer vacation period. Each fifth quinmester attended by the pupil could possibly accelerate his graduation from high school forty-five days, although the summer quinmester may be used by the pupils for enrichment and remedial experiences and not result in an accelerated graduation.

The extended school year organization does not radically affect the present operational calendar and provides the community with the option of an extended school year program while maintaining the present calendar structure.

The quinmester program theoretically has the potential to increase the capacity of school plants by 25 percent. A school having a capacity of 2,000 pupils could conceivably enroll 2,500 over the entire year, yet because of the staggered attendance periods have but 2,000 pupils in attendance during any given quinmester. Increased plant capacity could be achieved also through the acceleration procedures provided with this plan.

It was apparent to Dade County from the beginning that any plan that mandated pupil vacation periods would not be acceptable to the community. Therefore, to the extent possible, the five quinmesters have been scheduled so that four quinmesters coincide with the regular school year, while the fifth quinmester represents a 45-day summer session.

Specifically, the long-range objective of the quinmester program is: To develop a year-round school program which can be phased into operation without mandating student attendance sessions and that can be implemented without requiring drastic changes in community life, calendar patterns, school procedures, and organization, and one which requires the least increase in the school system's operating costs as compared to other extended school year plans.

The strategy of the quinmester extended school year program provides significant implications for curriculum improvement. The revisions necessary to implement this program of instruction enhances the opportunities to further stimulate each student attending school through a study plan unique to his level of interests, capabilities, and needs.

A program of 9-week, non-graded, non-sequential courses of instruction has been developed in Dade County in each subject area of the curriculum. There is a broad range of courses that has been developed, from the remedial to the highly sophisticated. This type of curriculum structure provides each student with the opportunity to individualize his program by selecting from a large number of quinmester courses the learning experiences which will be of greatest interest and meaning to him while complying with the standards established by the state accreditation program and the School Board of Dade County, Florida.

Although plan utilization and the distribution of students among various physical facilities is a primary concern, the point of view of curriculum change is an important one in terms of program development.

As school experiences are made more appropriate, relevant and flexible, it is anticipated that the number of student failures and dropouts will be reduced. At the same time, students will be afforded opportunities for much broader exploratory investigations in a variety of subject areas.

Some considerations for a district planning a year-round school program are:

1. In addition to involving instructional staff members in the development of the program, special planning sessions need to be arranged for school level administrators.

2. Provide constant public and school board reports on the progress made in the development of the year-round school program.

3. Specifically state the objectives of the program so that no misunderstanding will occur as schools adopt the program.

4. Exercise care and discretion in the selection of pilot schools to implement the program.

5. Address the planning process to the school level needs necessary for the implementation of the program.

6. Establish a steering committee to review and provide input in the developmental stages of the program.

7. Plan administrative planning sessions with school level administrators piloting the program.

8. Provide public information carefully delineating those kinds of problems and issues that require resolution prior to the implementation of the program. These issues should be clearly stated and demarcated from the typical and administrative problems presently existing within the district.

9. Take specific care not to attach to the year-round school program other instructional designs that may be desirable but are not essential to successful implementation of the year-round school program, i.e., non-graded structures, team teaching.

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS FOR IN-BETWEENERS

Ms. Chris Short
Teacher
Mollela Grade School
Mollela, Oregon

After four years of year-round school (two with the quarter system, two with 45-15), most schedule-related problems are solved or near solution. What remains is to fully utilize the flexibility of the 45-15 schedule in educating our students. What can 45-15 offer?

The obvious advantage lies in being able to recycle students who are having difficulities through an additional three-, six-, or nine week period. Not much of this has been tried to date because it requires changing teachers and much individual preparation. In short, it is a new idea that takes extra effort - effort that our teachers find hard to give considering the normal demands of teaching.

In contrast to "recycling" students, acceleration is a possibility in certain situations. We are currently involved in organizing the scope and sequence of our entire curriculum in grades one to eight. When that is accomplished, students could advance through skill levels more quickly by using their vacation time. The realization of this is several years away for us even if we choose this as an alternative.

For intermediate and junior high students, we have a limited and loosely organized tutoring program. Tutoring falls into two categories. Some students return during their vacations to help and some teachers release students from classes. The teachers who promote tutoring often instruct the students in tutoring techniques. Those of us who have used student tutors find success lies as much with organizing tasks for the student tutor as with the competency of the student tutor.

The community school concept may offer opportunities and resources to extend and enrich basic education. Mini-courses led by community members or students instructing other students are viable possibilities. The development of a wide range of programs depends upon school philosophy and staffing.

The year-round school offers a few new opportunities for improving education. With the exception of "recycling" students, nothing prohibits a traditional schedule school from using these other ideas. Year-round school people should consider these and other alternatives that may increase effective teaching by utilizing fully their schedule and facilities. It is easy to think one is improving just because the schedule is different. The serious business comes in developing techniques or offering curriculum that improves all students' chances to obtain a good education, and perhaps one that is rewarding in the process.

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS FOR OLDTIMERS

Dr. Gene Henderson
Superintendent of Francis Howell School District
St. Charles, Missouri
and
Board Member, National Council on Year-Round Education

Districts which have managed to get started on a revised calendar have frequently found that the support of the community has grown dramatically over several years of operation. The Francis Howell District in St. Charles County, Missouri, now in its sixth year of operation on the 45-15 schedule, started with strong teacher approval and less than 65 percent parent approval. Teacher support has continued at a very high level. Parent support grew to about 85 per cent and then declines to about 75 percent in the most recent survey (November 1974). Parent approval of the schedule is much stronger among the parents of younger students. The November survey revealed parents felt the year-round plan hindered their children's learning as follows: Grades 1-3, 4 percent; Grades 4-6, 7 percent; Grades 7, 8, 12 percent; Grade 9, 22 percent. Seasonal vacations were considered undesirable as follows: Grades 1-3, 14 percent; Grades 4-6, 16 percent; Grades 7, 8, 27 percent; and Grade 9, 50 percent.

Teachers continue to enjoy working nine weeks followed by a three-week vacation. There is the general feeling among teachers and administrators that learning is improved although the hard data attesting to this is not available.

There have been a number of cases in which the schools have decided to discontinue year-round plans after a short experience. This is no doubt disheartening for those responsible for the planning and the implementation, but it at least indicates the responsiveness of schools and their willingness to change. Francis Howell's ninth grade began the year-round, nine-week, three-week schedule in July of 1974 and the program will be discontinued at the end of June 1975. Teachers and parents, especially those with an interest in music which is very strong at Francis Howell, opposed continuing the ninth grade and further implementation in the upper grades. Survey results were as follows: Parents of 7th graders favored year-round for grades 9-12, 146 to 138 (number of responses); parents of 8th graders opposed it 143 to 148; and parents of 9th graders opposed it 93 to 133.

Occasionally there is a surprising development in the rapidly changing scene. The Francis Howell District has been in a continuing building program; and the uneven growth of the various areas has caused the need for recycling, that is, the reassignment of students from school to school and from schedule to schedule. The district reassigned about 200 students at the end of 1974, with such reassignments becoming effective July 1975. Letters announcing these changes have brought no complaints. This is quite unusual.

The initial reservations voiced by parents at the time the year-round schedule was first considered have continued to be the problems faced. One of the most prominent of these is certainly the family vacation. The flexibility which a summer free of educational responsibilities affords the average family seems to be very important. Employers frequently restrict the available times for vacations and parents expect the schools to be flexible since they are unsuccessful in changing their employers' plans.

After years of experience with a revised schedule, there are mixed emotions about it. There is no doubt that it was a challenging experience. Few of the educators involved feel that learning was adversely affected; on the contrary, there is good reason to believe it might be enhanced. In most instances, year-round schools and year-round school districts are surrounded by districts on the nine-month schedule. Even after years of operation there are continuing problems in coordinating the new schedules with the old, as influenced by legislation, state education agencies, nearby communities, neighboring school districts, and new residents.

The year-round movement has provided school districts with additional ammunition to be stored, sometimes used, in their arsenal of techniques to meet educational needs. The strength and diversity of these ideas will be influential in calendar patterns of the future. Communities and boards of education are reluctant to embark on changes which have not been tried before.

Ray Schneringer
Assistant Principal of Arvada West Senior High School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

If you have ever talked shop with a lineman on any football team, undoubtedly he talked about all the work being performed, "in the trenches." Reflecting back over the first year on the Concept 6 program, I must say, "Amen" to the trenches. There were days when those trenches were pretty deep. The administrators, the teachers, the secretaries, the custodians, I leave no one out of the picture, have had to work many long hours, organize more efficiently, be more tolerant with department members, and the list goes on and on.

As with any new program, things happened throughout the year which necessitated immediate, on-the-spot decisions. We found ourselves getting away from data processing service and had to revise our grading and scheduling systems. Fortunately the faculty at Arvada West was committed to making this program work. Department chairmen generated new ideas, teachers used a variety of classroom methods, and the custodial staff worked on a year-round plan for maintaining the building and grounds.

A county coordinating committee was formed and was kept very busy keeping abreast of the activities going on in the two pilot areas. Members of this committee included students, parents, teachers, and administrators from both areas. This committee formulated proposals which were considered and passed by the board of education. Hopefully some of the first year's problems will be resolved as a result of this action.

So far, I haven't mentioned a great deal about the students. I feel a student may obtain a good education in any program. By that, I mean whether it be a year-round, split session, extended day or traditional program, a student, if he is willing may obtain a sound education. However, we have been able to offer students opportunities on the Concept 6 plan which were not available on the traditional year. While a student is on vacation he may enroll in school, on a space available basis. He may take as many classes as he is able to handle. This is done by students for acceleration, remediation, or just because thay want to take it. A student may enroll in a Bonus Learning Session for credit or no credit. These B.L.S. classes are at least 40 hours in length for credit but may be of shorter duration in non-credit classes. Some of these B.L.S. classes have been great experiences for the students as well as the teachers.

In summary, this first year on the Concept 6 program has been a mixture, not always equal, of pain, hard work, fun, and great challenge.

Dr. Don E. Glines
Year-Round Education Consultant
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Year-round education is still in the propeller stage. The elementary programs are probably at best at the Spirit of St. Louis level. We are just about ready to try to cross the Atlantic. We have piloted such models as 45/15 and the Flexible Year Plan. We now have confidence that improved versions of those models might be ready to tackle the Atlantic, if we can find some Charles Lindberghs.

At the high school level we are still back at the Eddie Rickenbacker stage, flying biplanes over France, holding them together with the proverbial baling wire. We have not yet even reached the General Mitchell stage by being court-martialed. We have not yet been enough threat to the Admirals of the Fleet and the Generals of the Air Force. Probably the worst of the year-round programs to date are at the junior high level, where a worn-out curricular program has been given a different calendar.

All this is not negative. The important point is that a few Wright Brothers have grasped an idea and have said, "We think this might help the educational efforts of this Nation." They have carried the development through the early stages of the propeller era. We need to be grateful and give credit to the pioneering efforts around the Nation.

The development of the 45/15, and 60/20, the Quinmester, the Quarter, the Trimester, Concept 8, Concept 6, the Flexible All-Year, the Personalized Continuous Year, and other such year-round calendars, has been a great transitional step. However, it is time now for the veterans in the year-round movement to move out of the early propeller stage. It is time for us to join Imagineering Studios, where we can create new learning systems for the Third Century of America.

There are better, more flexible year-round calendars just around the corner. We need to individualize and personalize programs for the students. We need to see education as a continuous life-long learning process, available seven days a week, 365 days a year. We need to join such movements as community education. We need to pilot such proposals as the educational system for the Minnesota Experimental City. We need to move to the P-38 stage, and then rapidly into the Jet Era.

It is time for the oldtimers to return to the Room of Imagination and propose and implement the next great steps beyond the 45/15 or quarter system year-round plans that now exist in the United States. The task of the oldtimers is to cross the Atlantic, to bomb the battleship, and to invent the early jet.

A Year-Round Education Model Designed To Achieve Academic Excellence for its Graduates

Dr. Dwain L. Thatcher
Research Supervisor
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Two features of Concept 6, and most year-round calendars, imply a need for an individual curriculum. With two vacation periods per student each year causing two-thirds of the student body to be coming or going every eight weeks and with the necessity to repeat a previous quarter of material in four of the six sessions, the instructional scheme must be most versatile to meet the needs of each student.

Russell Junior High in Colorado Springs has met this challenge by organizing its offerings into units of study that the individual approaches at his own pace and which require varying lengths of time to complete. When a student finishes a quarter, his instruction stops with the last unit completed in the session. Upon his return, the next quarter begins with the next unit of study in the sequence. Probably his vacation has not caused any great loss of learning since it is short enough to prevent large setbacks.

With all students working independently, two quarters of the four sessions must be presented in the same time frame but this causes no major problem. The student is working on his own material regardless of what was covered by other students the previous quarter.

The next phase of our district's development in implementing the Concept 6 calendar is to expand into the high school level. The knowledge and experience gained in our present junior high project will be applied in producing the high school curriculum. All courses will need to be developed on a quarter basis and be as independent of sequence as possible. It may be that basic courses will be offered for a quarter duration with a variety of alternatives available to follow the basic course. With this type of course, once the basic material has been completed, the rest of the year will not be dependent upon sequence. Probably math is the only exception to this procedure, and then possibly not in all courses.

One of the unique opportunities offered by a Concept 6 calendar is the necessity of providing one two-week period of instruction outside the normal stream of the classroom. Since the school building cannot hold all of the students at once and since there are not enough days available for 172 days of classroom instruction in each pattern, Concept 6 provides each student with a week or more of intersession classes. These mini-courses may range from required remedial help to a week-long trip for instruction in how to ski. Ninth graders have been scheduled for high school during this time and have found the process to be far superior to what had preceded it. Over 200 mini-courses have been offered during the first two years that Concept 6 has been used at Russell Junior High.

Follow-up of the school's first ninth-grade class has produced some encouraging results of the instructional program at Russell. Former project students attending Palmer High School comprise one-third of the sophomore class, over one-half of the top five percent, nearly half of the second five percent, but only one-fifth of the lowest ten percent. A much smaller number attend Mitchell High School and have about the same percent of the upper and lower ten percent as their percentage of the sophomore class.

Robert H. Williams
Superintendent of Rialto Unified School District
Rialto, California

What will happen in a school system when a principal is given the option to open the doors of his school on a year-round basis? What will happen when a school becomes non-graded and instruction is designed to meet the personal needs of the learner? What will happen when teachers may receive extra pay for more days worked or allowed one quarter off for college courses? What will happen when teachers are given ten paid days each year for planning?

In the late 1960's the Hayward Unified School District decided it was time to seek out the answers to these questions. After much preliminary planning and community involvement, the Park School of Hayward established the first year-round, four-quarter school of recent times. Since 1968 a dedicated principal, staff, and community have addressed themselves to "Academic Excellence" on a four quarter, 195-day schedule.

The key to this successful venture was in allowing more time and respect for the teaching staff to plan and prepare for the individual needs of pupils. Test data have shown those pupils who have been on the extended year program for five years are a year or more ahead of their peers who experienced the traditional schedule. Surveys of grades and test scores from the junior high school attended by Park students place them in the top quartile of academic achievement. In addition, the leadership roles of Park students in the junior high school was above average for the percentage of the student body they represented. Parents continue to support the year-round calendar and insist they will never return to the traditional schedule. One can conclude that this model is a successful one in reaching for "Academic Excellence."

A Look at Year-Round Education Operating in Colleges and Universities

Dr. Edward C. Frederick
Provost of University of Minnesota Technical College
Waseca, Minnesota

The University of Minnesota Technical College-Waseca is a relatively new institution which began operation in the fall of 1971. The Technical College has a single mission -- that of preparing students for mid-management, semi-professional positions in the broad fields related to agriculture.

The College adopted a year-round educational program at the outset in order to meet the needs of students and agriculture. The college operates on a quarterly basis, with the summer quarter being no different than the fall, winter, and spring quarters. Students can start any quarter and graduate any quarter, they can go continuously or intermittently, full-time or part-time.

Planning for the College tied the year-round concept into all phases of the operation before the doors actually opened. Programs were developed with a minimum of prerequisites and most courses are self-contained units. Staff are hired who are willing to teach in a year-round program. Nine-month faculty are rotated throughout the year. Registration, financial aids, veteran's assistance and other procedures have been developed to fit a year-round program.

Times have changed and so has agriculture. Because of herbicides and other modern technology, the summer months are not the busiest quarter on the farm or in the agri-businesses in the area served by the College. Planting time in the spring and harvesting time in the fall are busier. With a year-round program, some students can and do attend classes in the summer and winter and "stop out" in the spring for planting crops and in the fall for harvesting.

Technical College-Waseca emphasizes laboratory and practical experiences. The year-round program makes use of outdoor agricultural laboratories which are most highly developed during the summer months. Another plus is the efficient use of the facilities and research at the adjacent 840-acre Southern Experiment Station, another unit of the University of Minnesota. The year-round program of the College allows for maximum use of the Southern Experiment Station in the teaching program during the summer months as well as throughout the year.

With the four-quarter system, students may start college classes immediately after finishing high school and thus graduate and begin employment earlier. Students also have an opportunity to accelerate their program by going continuously throughout the year.

One quarter of employment experience is part of our technical program. This is called the Preoccupational Preparation Program and gives the student practical industry experience. The year-round education system assists this internship program in that it allows the student to be out in industry during the quarter that is most advantageous from a learning point of view. For example, in the field of horticulture, the student may go out to work in the industry in the spring and return to the College in the summer.

Greater use can be made of expensive facilities and equipment needed in a Technical College in a year-round program. It also provides for increasing the number of graduates without increasing the physical facilities in the same relationship, something which interests legislators today.

Enrollment is continuing to increase rapidly in all quarters including the summer quarter. Twenty-five percent of the students that enroll in summer quarter are directly out of high school.

Some areas of concern in year-tound education which need to be overcome include faculty fatigue and time for professional updating, maintenance of the physical plant, need for air conditioning in the summer, and misunderstandings that result from breaking with tradition. This latter is one of the toughest hurdles. An attempt is being made to overcome faculty fatigue and professional updating by utilizing nine-month appointments and rotating those to cover the year, team teaching, single quarter leaves, and others.

The year-round program has been well accepted by the students and the agricultural industry. It gives a great deal of flexibility to the program at Waseca. The quality of education has been improved. The advantages outweigh the disadvantages. For the Technical College for Agriculture at Waseca, the year-round program is not a concept but an idea "whose time has come."

Dr. John D. McLain
Director, Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania
Director, Education Development Center for Year-Round Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
and
Treasurer, National Council on Year-Round Education

If we apply the same definitions of year-round education at the higher education level as we do basic education levels (K-12), then many if not most institutions of higher education already have year-round programs.

The optional four-quarter plan, whereby the regular school year is divided into three quarters with summer school being offered as a fourth quarter, was the standard plan for state college systems in Oregon back in the 1930's and 1940's when I went to school there. I was able to accelerate and complete my undergraduate work in three years. I also accelerated my doctoral work at the University of Oregon in the same way. Many colleges and universities are organized on a quarter basis and offer such programs.

Other higher education institutions operate on a semester basis. Most of these offer summer programs. In Pennsylvania, for example, the state system offers a varied summer program. We offer two six-week sessions, or twelve weeks during the summer so a student may take a six-week course in the first half of summer, a six-week course in the second half of the summer, or both. Offered at the same time is a three-week presession, a six-week summer session, and a three-week post-session -- in such a way that a student can study three, six, nine, or twelve weeks during the summer, as his need may be. Again, this or similar patterns are common throughout the country.

Some colleges, for example the University of Pittsburgh and, I believe, the University of Florida, operate on a trimester basis. As in the case of the other two plans, however, the institution operates about 48 weeks a year, which is, as we apply the common definition, year-round education.

All of these are optional programs. I have heard that one or more universities have used the mandated rotating four-quarter plan when demand for college admission was far greater than the supply. I do not know the details of any such programs but would be interested in knowing about them if they do exist or have existed.

A technique Clarion has been using the past ten years is to admit some freshmen students to summer school; they then remain out of school the first semester and re-enter the second semester, thereby leveling out the enrollments to serve a greater number. By going the second summer, the student can then catch up at the sophomore level with those who had gone both semesters during the regular year.

There are significant reasons why these plans were readily accepted at the college level when they were not accepted at the basic school level: First all, college students are more independent from the family schedule then are the younger children; Secondly, the percentage of students going to summer school, or even college at all, is small compared to the total population of that age span; Thirdly, there is a major population which is best served by summer school -- teachers going back to college for further training for one reason or another; Fourth, a college draws upon a statewide, nationwide, or even worldwide geographic area and can adjust its course offerings to the demand for specific courses.

Just as there are reasons why such programs are acceptable, there are reasons why other plans would be unacceptable.

The trimester plan at the University of Pittsburgh, for example, has difficulty because its second "mester" begins in April. Most of those who go on for the third session are those who are already enrolled the second session. It is out of step with the public schools for summer school and other work-study patterns when students change from one institution to another.

Also, when enrollments drop and a student can get into many colleges or universities he makes his choice. Mandated schedules are difficult if not impossible to manage.

The patterns of our higher educations adapt to changes and changing needs just as do our basic schools, but the needs are different so the patterns are different.

Comparing Pupil Achievement in Year-Round Schools and in the Traditional Setting

Dr. Roslyn M. Grady
Director of Research
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Achievement tests were given to all pupils in grades K-9 in the Colorado Springs School District's Concept 6 year-round schools and their matched control schools. Tests included global measures of achievement based on nationally standardized tests as well as standardized tests in curriculum areas such as algebra and geometry. Some district criterion-referenced tests in science, mathematics, and foreign language were also included in the evaluation.

Although analysis of covariance showed some statistical significance between year-round students and those in traditional schools, most of these differences were of no educational significance. Basically, student achievement was the same in both schools. For the few differences that did occur, the trend appeared to favor the year-round students on measures most directly connected with the curriculum of a particular course and the traditional students on a broadly based standardized achievement test.

Student attitudinal results favored the year-round school pupils on both measures of self-concept and attitude towards school at the elementary level and split at the junior high level with year-round pupils slightly higher in self-concept and traditional pupils slightly higher in attitude towards school.

A follow-up study of present tenth-grade pupils who had attended grade nine in year-round or traditional schools showed some superiority in first semester sophomore grades for the year-round students.

LEARNING FROM FAILURE -- A COMMUNITY REJECTS YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Dr. James C. Mounie
Assistant Superintendent
Virginia Beach Public Schools
Virginia Beach, Virginia

The Virginia Beach experiment with cycled-attendance, year-round operation of schools was a success rather than a failure. The pilot program was merely a research and development effort to determine whether cycled-attendance was, for Virginia Beach, a feasible alternative to building more schools.

It was designed to provide answers, not to support any pre-determined position for or against the year-round operation of schools. It was an attempt to go beyond trial and error as a means of introducing innovative educational programs.

The Virginia Beach 45-15 pilot program has done precisely what it was designed to do - generate data to be used by the school board to make decisions for the Virginia Beach public schools. We used the research and development approach because, quite frankly, after much study of other programs, we felt that we had no supportable answers about the feasibility of 45-15 for our district. We were convinced that the information available about the benefits of year-round education was not sufficiently conclusive, nor sufficiently generalizeable, for the City of Virginia Beach to accept it and to put 55 schools on a year-round calendar.

While the school board felt that the call for wide-spread adoption of the year-round calendar was unwarranted, it felt that arbitrary rejection of the concept was just as irresponsible. We felt that we had to find the answers in and for Virginia Beach, and for that reason we followed a systematic planning and preparation plan and we designed and executed a systematic evaluation of the pilot program.

Materials, procedures, processes, and evaluations are documented in many publications and have been made available to our public and many other districts. If one reads them carefully, one sees that at no time have we claimed that year-round education was a failure. What Virginia Beach has said is simply that year-round education is not for everybody and certainly not for Virginia Beach at this time. The responsible members of the "movement" have never claimed otherwise.

In my recommendation to the school board, I made the statement that

> . . .in many ways, the 45-15 calendar as it has existed here, has been equal to, but not better than the traditional school year. Problems and short-falls found in the program could be reduced if the board were willing to modify some of its basic commitments. . .

In the same presentation, I summarized the data which had been provided the board and public by saying that

> (1) most youth-oriented agencies and services were able to adjust their programs to accommodate 45-15 pupils, (2) while it was found that the buildings operating on the 45-15 calendar accommodated more pupils than if they had operated on the traditional calendar, the net dollar savings was only $8 per pupil because other costs were higher. (Example: space cost $20.78 less per pupil, for instructional staff was $40.23 more), (3) the pupils in 45-15 schools learned as well as, but no better than, pupils in the nine-month schools. (4) the pupils in the 45-15 schools had a more positive attitude toward school than pupils in the nine-month schools, (5) after a year of experience with 45-15, 45.3 percent of the pupils indicated that they liked 45-15 and 46.3 percent said that they did not like it, (6) after a year of experience, 73.6 percent of the teachers in the pilot schools felt that the program should be continued, (7) after a year of experience, 46.8 percent of the parents characterized their attitude toward 45-15 as positive, 30.7 per-

cent as negative and 22.5 percent were uncertain, and 50.0 percent felt that the program should be continued. . .

The board terminated its pilot program primarily because the logically promised space increase could not be realized. The increasing population was the reason for trying year-round operation; and the mobility of the population was the reason for terminating the program. In the final recommendation, it was pointed out that

> . . .a highly mobile population, limited population pools, and a commitment to common family attendance, the groups were unequal in size and resulted in overcrowding in some in-school groups, grade combination and an increase in the per pupil cost of some resources. . .and the one thing that cannot be modified is the mobility of the population. . .
>
> . . .while the evaluation reports have provided some rather firm data on which to base a decision, it seems that you must in the final analysis, make a value judgment. The question becomes one of whether or not 45-15, as we have experienced it, is worth foregoing your commitment to common family attendance and relatively compact geographic attendance zones. . .

It came down to a local decision -- a value judgment of the more acceptable alternatives. The data and the decision are not and were not intended to be generalizeable beyond the district.

The answer for Virginia Beach cannot and should not be considered the answer for other districts. Neither should the Valley View experience be considered to have provided meaningful answers for other districts. It seems to me that if a district wants to examine year-round education, it must try it on a limited basis in a research and development pilot program on its own turf. The research and development approach is the only possible way to take year-round education or any innovation beyond trial and error.

Dr. Wesley Apker
Executive Secretary
National Association of State Boards of Education
Denver, Colorado

The Evergreen School District, located in the southwestern corner of the State of Washington, directly across the river from Portland, Oregon, had tripled its student population in ten years. Elementary students double shifted for one year, junior high school students double shifted for 3-1/2 years due to consecutive capital construction bond levy failures and poor enrollment forecasting. The district experienced a two-week teacher strike in May of 1973, culminating in the three-month jailing of the strike leaders. The presenter became superintendent the end of June 1973.

Discussions regarding the year-round school first took place during the 1970-71 school year. A random poll of 350 patrons taken that year disclosed 50.6 percent in favor of further study on the concept and 49.4 percent in favor of no further investigation. The main argument presented in favor of year-round schools in 1970-71 was that it would solve, for a time, the classroom shortage. During the 1972-73 school year, active interest was rekindled with the double shifting of two of the district's six elementary schools. The junior high commenced double shifting in September of 1970. The citizen and administration year-round school study committee narrowed the possible year-round school plans to either the "Jeffco Concept 6" or the "45-15" plans.

During the 1973-74 school year a prestigious group of lay citizens convened to:

Review current literature
Review the work of previous committees
Review indepth the "Jeffco Concept 6" and "45-15" plans

Recommend a plan
Cost the plan
Develop arguments for and against
Seek board authorization to hold public hearings
Recommend the mechanism for determining the public will.

The study committee convened in September and in December recommended the 45-15 plan, K-12, to commence July 1, 1975. Members presented their best judgment regarding the cost savings and added costs. They also recommended that only persons attending the public hearings on the year-round school plus those requesting informational packets be allowed to cast a ballot and that 60 percent of those voting, vote yes. Finally an extensive media explanation of the year-round school was also planned.

The Results: Thirteen informational public hearings attracted over 700 citizens, teachers and students. Special presentations were made to classroom teachers. Less than one percent of the registered voters attended the well publicized hearings; of the active school election voters, 12 percent attended.

Teacher association reaction was hostile but not publicly opposed, with promise to the superintendent to "bargain hard for teacher interests".

Individual teacher reaction showed teachers were interested, but concerned, particularly at the secondary level.

Public reaction was 849 votes cast, representing a 77 percent return of ballots: Yes, 50.5 percent; No, 49.5 percent; 52 percent of the people who did not attend a meeting but simply read the packet opposed year-round school.

Most numerous reasons given for supporting year-round school (in rank order):

1. More educational benefits for children, i.e., better learning retention;
2. School facilities would be utilized efficiently;
3. Offers more vacation selections;
4. Provides a better use of tax dollars.

Most numerous reasons given for not supporting year-round school (in rank order):

1. Not enough research has gone into the study;
2. Too confusing to the whole family;
3. Not enough vacation time during periods of good weather;
4. Costs would be too high;
5. The informational hearings were too biased in favor of year-round school.

What would I do differently:

1. Involve the education association from the beginning;
2. Attempt to document more carefully "new costs" and "saved costs";
3. Offer year-round school on a voluntary one- or two-school basis as a start up;
4. Invest more dollars in analyzing curricular impact prior to the public hearings;
5. Make absolutely certain the public hearings were not biased.

Dr. Guilbert C. Hentschke
Associate Professor of Education and Management
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

One of the fundamental reasons for undertaking year-round education in Virginia Beach, Virginia, was the hope of saving money. Largely because of this the pilot approach to year-round education in Virginia Beach provided for substantial resources to estimate the cost impact of the program. The cost analysis extended over a nearly two-year period, during which time a computer-based cost model of the Virginia Beach pilot and regular elementary schools was constructed and validated.

The process involved the use of computer simulation techniques, including several iterations of what might be called "model construction/parameter estimation/validation". Actually two models were ultimately constructed: one to model the results of the 1973-74 school year and another to assess the cost impact of an expanded program over each of the next five years. In both cases the estimated savings to accrue from year-round education in Virginia Beach were much less than expected or than reported in studies conducted elsewhere.

Although the school board decided to abandon year-round education in Virginia Beach, my impression is that, far from feeling a sense of failure, both the board and the administrative staff there feel they gained a great deal of insight into the operational complexities and ramifications of year-round education. This experience leads us to suggest a major corollary to the "theory" of year-round education. This corollary may be stated as follows: the degree to which districts are not able to realize the dollar benefits of increased space utilization in year-round cycled attendance is a function of some combination of the following factors:

1. net migration of the student population;
2. the relative price of student transportation;
3. the degree of public indifference to busing students out of their local attendance area.

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION--SUCCESS STORIES (AND A FEW BRUISES)

C. J. Nichols
Chairman of the Board of Education
Sunnyside Public Schools
Tucson, Arizona

Sunnyside School District, located in the southern portion of Tucson, Arizona, is a K-12 school system with over 10,500 students. It was forced to go on YRS program on account of space. We had two elementary schools on double sessions plus one junior high school on extended days schedule; also, we were at our bonding limit for building additional facilities.

Sunnyside selected the 45-15 YRS program as having the most desirable features of all the YRS programs we had studied. Here are some of the essential ingredients of going on a 45-15 YRS program.

1. Have a citizen committee study all the alternatives and make recommendations.
2. Have your top man (your superintendent) sold on the program so that he can make it work. He in turn, must sell his staff and they must sell the teachers on the advantages of YRS. We paid expenses for administrators and teachers who were the leaders of opposition to YRS and sent them to the National YRS Seminars in Virginia Beach and San Diego. They came back as boosters for the system.
3. All board members must be convinced that YRS is the way to go. Again, by attending YRS seminars, they were able to eliminate any doubts about the system.

4. You must hold community meetings and tell the citizens what alternatives there are for solving the overcrowded school problems. When they are explained, the 45-15 YRS stands head and shoulders above any other alternative.
5. You must allow at least one year to set up and implement a YRS program.

Our experience shows we found some frosting on the cake in educational and financial benefits. We believe the 45-15 YRS should be sold on these benefits even if you do not need the space. Some of them are:

1. We saved over five million dollars bond and interest money.
2. All students were placed on regular school schedule. Schools can accommodate one-third more students in the same buildings.
3. There were lower class loads.
4. We found better employment opportunities for high school students as only one-fourth of them will be hunting jobs at any given time of the year.
5. We experienced a seven percent reduction in our high school student dropout rate.
6. We have experienced a three percent better record for teacher attendance.
7. We experienced almost a fifty percent reduction in vandalism.
8. We show a three percent better attendance among our students.
9. There was a renewed interest on part of teachers as a result of coming up with new lesson plans to fit the 45-15 program.
10. The plan has the ability to offer teachers many alternatives in their contracts.
11. It offers the ability to offer many more mini-courses at the junior and high school level.
12. We have observed improvement in grade averages of many students.
13. There was a reduction in juvenile delinquency as a result of only one-fourth of the student body running the streets at any given period of the year.
14. There was better learning continuity on the part of students with only a three-week break instead of three-month break.
15. There were better accommodations in the community, i.e., at parks, recreational areas, etc., as a result of three-fourth of the students in school and one-fourth on vacation at any given time.
16. Our taxpayers now feel Sunnyside is better utilizing their tax dollars in the operation of their schools.

Some bruises of the YRS system are:

1. Teachers tend to dislike the system if they reside in another school system not on the 45-15 and they have children on a regular school plan.
2. Some parents object to the system if they are accustomed to taking a two-or-three-month vacation during the summer months.
3. Some special effort is required in special programs such as band and other types of special music programs.
4. The multi-tract classes in some high school subjects creates more effort on the part of the teacher to make the program work; however, it tends to force individualized instruction, and in theory this is an ideal situation.

(Mr. Nichols has graciously offered to visit any school district in the process of planning for YRE to expand on Sunnyside's experiences if he can be reimbursed for expenses. His telephone numbers are - Home: (602)294-4270, and Office: (602)294-3441.)

James D. Bingle
Former School Board Member
Valley View Public Schools
Plainfield, Illinois
and
Board Member, National Council on Year-Round Education

In the summer of 1970, over 6,600 Valley View School District students abandoned their summer vacations and went back to the classroom in what has turned out to be an entirely innovative concept of year-round school. Now, after nearly five years of operation, the Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan can be rightly considered a "way of life," so much so that the District is now more concerned with other programs - open concept, curriculum reform, special education, etc.

But this "success" did not just happen. It was a result of a team effort among administration, Board of Education, teachers, students, and community. In my presentation, I will discuss this team effort. But first, a little background is in order.

Calendar revision in Valley View School District was dictated solely by economic necessity. An unbelievable geometric progression of enrollments - from 219 in 1958, to 1,800 in 1962, to 3,750 in 1966, and to 6,650 in 1970 - had exhausted the District of its bonding power. The voters of the district never once turned down an educational rate increase or a bond referendum to provide the needed schools over that 12-year period, but finally the statutory limit on bonded indebtedness was reached.

And then in 1967, the Illinois General Assembly mandated kindergarten in all public schools in the state by 1970. This meant an addition of 800 kindergarteners, plus the normal yearly growth of over 600 students, to an already overcrowded school system. It was willing, but legally unable, to provide additional facilities.

Fortunately, the Administration and the Board of Education were aware of the magnitude of the coming problem early in 1968. Only three possible alternatives were available:

1. To place a large part of the school district on double shifts.
2. To increase the size of classes to 40 or 50 students.
3. To consider school calendar reform.

The first two alternatives were considered educationally inferior both by the administration and by the community, while school calendar reform was an unknown quantity.

The administration embarked on an intensive study of the voluminous published literature available on year-round calendar plans. Review of the available bibliography revealed one salient fact. Most commentators were concerned, not with making new calendar programs work, but with arming administrators and teachers with objections and arguments to combat the pressures for year-round schools. (These pressures originated primarily with businessmen and trade and taxpayers' organizations which wanted to adopt what seemed to be, on the surface, an entirely reasonable and workable business proposition.) Little practical information existed.

In studying the feasibility of a year-round calendar plan, the administration estimated that some form of calendar revision could be effected in three years. The Board of Education, however, faced the reality of the housing crisis brought on by the pending arrival in September 1970 of a continuing onrush of kindergarten students. Brushing aside the caution of the administration, the Board members voted on August 15, 1968, that a year-round plan must be implemented by the 1970-71 school year when the kindergarteners would arrive.

With the two-year deadline a reality, the Valley View administrators faced the task of researching, developing, and implementing a viable and acceptable plan that would meet the needs of the student body and would also win the acceptance and cooperation of the faculty and the community. The administration's research made abundantly clear that none of the dozens of plans that had been proposed previously would be workable in the Valley View District, nor would they be acceptable today in any other school system.

It was necessary to cast away all previous concepts of year-round school programs and to develop a workable calendar of our own. In less than 60 days of "cut and fit" experimentation with theoretical calendars, the administration evolved the "Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan."

Only 19 months remained to put this paper "plan" into actual operation, a very short time considering the magnitude of the problems yet to be solved. It was necessary to work out the technicalities of scheduling, school census, transportation, air conditioning, curriculum adjustment, and teacher negotiations. These problems were in addition to passing in two sessions of the Illinois Legislature, needed changes in the law to make the 45-15 Plan legal (it was not). But perhaps the most important task facing the administration and Board over this 19-month period was to take the public into its confidence, keeping everyone informed as each step was taken leading to that first day of year-round school on June 30, 1970.

Fortunately, we looked upon all of these problems as challenges to be met and not as excuses for possible failure. Although life during these 19 months seemed like one perpetual crisis, nevertheless, the mood was always one of confidence and expectation. The fact that the Illinois Governor signed the bill making 45-15 legal in the state only the day before classes actually began on June 30, 1970 is evidence of this confidence amid crisis.

And now, nearly 5 years later, the 45-15 plan is definitely a success and a way of life in the Valley View District. It has been from the beginning a mandated plan - all children in the district must attend on the 45-15 schedule. At the present time this means over 12,000 students in 11 schools: 7 elementary, 2 junior high schools, and 2 senior high schools. Surveys have consistently shown that the community supports and approves of the plan by about a 10 to 1 margin.

In addition, the 45-15 plan, developed and pioneered at Valley View, has proven to be the most widely imitated year-round school plan in the Nation. At the present time there are over 50 school districts around the country that have implemented some version of the plan, and new districts are being added to the list each year.

Dr. Daniel Knueppel
Principal of Tenafly High School
Tenafly, New Jersey

Extended school year for Tenafly, New Jersey, means simply increasing options for high school students to enrich their curriculum. We have started small, with limited objectives, and are witnessing the program grow as staff, students and citizens see the benefit.

Analysis: Committees were formed at the inception to familiarize these three groups with the various concepts of the year-round school. A very conscious effort was made to make certain that students, staff, and community understood the fact that this program was being designed to meet the needs of our town and was not just being undertaken as another educational innovation.

Once this climate had been achieved and the groups had become familiar with the extended school year concept, a careful assessment of all of our circumstances was made. A professional poll of the community by the Oliver Quayle Company was conducted. An in-depth survey of student and staff interests and needs was made.

Decision/planning: All data was carefully organized so that all groups could easily see how the decision was to be made. Nothing was considered secret. Dr. Bruce Campbell of the New Jersey State Department helped secure state funds to assist in the planning for implementation; he also lent valuable expertise. The objective that was to be workable was based upon a strong feeling by all groups that the program should be voluntary and limited in initial scope, hence the development of the goal of curricular enrichment. All three groups were involved in determining how, and in what form, ESY would accomplish curricular enrichment. The decision reached was to break the full-year program into a fall and spring semester and create a variable scheduled summer semester. Curricular workshops were held. Matters relating to negotiation were referred

to the proper committees. Publicity was given to the fact that we would start with a small program and grow.

Implementation: Start-up for the program began with the current school year. All courses were semesterized and the first summer semester was operated. Twenty-five percent of the student body took advantage of the program. The number of January graduates doubled from the previous year. A reorganization of our curriculum took place as a result of the semesterizing process.

Our bruises have been insignificant. If any, they have healed very quickly. We started small, we are growing, and people are happy because all of this occurred over a three-year period. We have begun our constant monitoring of the program to develop more fully varied patterns for scheduling to enrich our program of education.

Charles E. Rufien
Bear Creek-Columbine Area Superintendent
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

Expanding enrollments, a shortage of classroom space, and requests from the business community to better utilize existing facilities caused the Jefferson County, Colorado, School Board of Education to consider year-round operation of schools as a possible solution to its classroom shortage. In the fall of 1971, the School Board appointed a district-wide study committee composed of parents, teachers, students, and administrators to study, explore, analyze, and develop a feasible year-round school plan.

From the review of all available literature, discussion with educators who have implemented year-round plans, and from input within the study group and community, it was clear that any plan adopted must be designed to meet the needs of our school locale. With this in mind, the study group said that the plan must have the capability of:

1. Being implemented kindergarten through grade twelve;
2. Insuring that family unity is preserved by offering the same school calendar to all students in the family;
3. Maintaining or improving the quality of education for students;
4. Allowing parents/students to voluntarily elect the sessions they would be in school and the vacation cycle;
5. Maintaining the nine-week curriculum block, so that work already under way in the district will have compatibility at no additional cost;
6. Providing an improved school year calendar with maximum flexibility for students, teachers and community;
7. Providing the most efficient possible use of capital facilities.

When several models demonstrating different combinations of these elements were drawn up, one particular plan identified as Concept 6 proved to be most acceptable for meeting local needs. Concept 6 in Jefferson County, therefore, means:

1. The school year consists of 6 terms.
2. Students elect to attend school four of the six terms for a minimum school year of 172 days.
3. Students may select, with the permission of the school, to attend school beyond 172 days for purposes of enrichment, remediation, or acceleration.
4. The school is open a minimum of 245 instructional days in each calendar year. This permits the school building to be used continuously year round.
5. Student vacations occur in three patterns. (For illustration purposes, the following dates will be used to demonstrate these patterns):

Vacation Pattern Number One: (Track A)	February 10 to April 5 and August 6 to September 30
Vacation Pattern Number Two: (Track B)	October 1 to December 1 and April 8 to June 2
Vacation Pattern Number Three: (Track C)	December 4 to February 5 and June 7 to August 6

6. Traditional school holidays such as Labor Day, Independence Day, Memorial Day, and the typical Thanksgiving holiday will be observed. Christmas vacation is shorter than that experienced in a traditional school calendar.
7. Kindergarten students may enter school on the first specified entry date following their fifth birthdays.
8. Teachers may contract to teach a maximum of five terms. Shorter teacher contracts of one, two, three, or four terms could also be available.
9. A significant gain in the use of capital facilities may be realized since a third of the students could be released to vacations during each term of the school year.
10. Students transferring into or out of a Concept 6 school should experience little difficulty fitting into the new school environment.

Once the design of the model was determined, an extensive public information campaign informing parents, students, teachers, administrators, and the community at large about the plan was conducted over a four-month period. An opinion survey, conducted by a professional consulting firm, to determine parent and school employees' attitudes about Concept 6 followed the information program.

Based upon this attitude survey, two areas within the R-1 School District, namely, Arvada West and Columbine, consisting of 16 schools and 13,000 students was chosen to pilot Concept 6 beginning July 30, 1974. During the two-year pilot, Concept 6 will be evaluated for its educational and economical feasibility and community acceptance.

A few of the bruises encountered, in my opinion, include:

1. The time from the development of the Concept 6 model in September 1972 to its implementation in July 1974 was too long.
2. Following the attitude survey given to a random sampling of citizens within Jefferson County, a second opinion survey by postcards was taken in the Arvada West and Columbine Areas. This second survey was not needed and did nothing but clutter initial data.
3. Concept 6 guidelines and characteristics were presented to parents and staffs as absolutes. As a result, when changes were needed in order to make the model more educationally and economically feasible, some accusations were made about breaking faith with the public. When a new model for year-round education is being piloted, modifications most likely will have to be made. Therefore, it is best not to promise more than what can definitely be delivered.
4. In pilot testing a year-round school program, all staff members, teachers and administrators alike, must be completely supportive of the concept. When this condition does not exist, it is extremely difficult to cope with and address the problems and difficulties that can and will occur during the pilot.
5. There was a general tendency to fix all of the advantages of Concept 6 to economic benefits and gains. Too little emphasis was placed on the possible educational advantages.

Mrs. Dottie Brenner
Teacher at Vanderhoof Elementary School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

The most rewarding aspect of Concept 6 has been the level of retention on the part of all students. For the first time, it has not been necessary to review the work from the previous

year. The only review has been that which is normal when teaching a new concept.

The second delight has been the terrific attitude the students have displayed twice. The vacations are more defined in their minds and it is no longer the drag from September through June, which is impossible for a young child to visualize.

Bonus Learning has been another plus to Concept 6. We offered a wide variety of Bonus Learning Sessions ranging from remedial to enrichment. Our experiences proved that we were remiss in offering remedial courses. Either the children didn't come to class or if they did, their parents thought a semester's work could be attained in six or eight hours of Bonus Learning.

Bonus Learning did demand much time in organization. We spent numerous staff meetings discussing schedules as well as choosing topics of personal interest. Beyond this point the time and effort was done on the teachers' individual time without monetary compensation.

Another positive arena has been the Arvada West Area Advisory Committee. This group consists of ten schools in the Arvada West area with the committee comprising a cross section of our community: parents, educators, and administrators. In order to alleviate various meetings several times each month, we combined the committees and now meet once every other month in an Area Town Meeting and the other month as a School Committee Meeting. The discussions have been beneficial and constructive and the shortened time element, meeting-wise, has been advantageous to all.

The fifth delight has been the cohesiveness of the teachers involved in Concept 6 working together to solidify goals. A select group has met each month on our own and recently put together, with some help from a Colorado Education Association staff member, our own survey for all teachers piloting the program. The results of the survey were recently compiled.

The joys we've experienced this past year far outweigh all the hours of scheduling and planning. It will be a pleasure to continue year-round education.

YRE--Pros and Cons from Parents and Students

Mrs. Lynn Engleby
Parent
Jefferson County School District R-1
Littleton, Colorado

Parental arguments in favor of a year-round school calendar center mainly on the economic and educational advantages of such a program. Some other benefits to the family can also be cited.

In the economic area, year-round use of school buildings is the foremost advantage. Although it costs more to operate a building for 12 months than it does for 9 months, the capital plant is not sitting idle for 3 months each year. The real economy to a growth area occurs because the capacity of each school is increased by one-fourth, and it is unnecessary to build as many new schools as would have to be built under a 9-month school schedule. Also, it is more productive to use teachers for more of the school year. Fewer teachers have to find second jobs, and they can be more productive at teaching.

Educationally, it has been pointed out that children forget less over a short vacation period than they would over a longer one, and teachers have to use less time for review after each vacation. Hence, more new material can be covered, or material can be covered in greater depth, than under a traditional calendar. Immediate remediation is possible with shorter school terms. A child who has done poorly in one term can repeat the term immediately or receive help during

his vacation period instead of waiting a whole year to receive remedial help. Under some year-round plans, such as Concept 6, there are provisions for intersessions or bonus learning courses for enrichment, acceleration, or remediation during a child's vacation period. A child's exposure to more academic or interest fields is thus increased.

With many entry dates during the year, it is possible to allow children to enter kindergarten right after their fifth birthday or to delay them for part of a year. With a screening system, five-year-olds can start school when they are ready, and through the screening process learning disabilities or other problems can be spotted before the child experiences failure.

Another advantage of the year-round calendar is that families can take vacations at times other than summer and Christmas, and families are enjoying experiences together that would not be possible under the traditional calendar. Further, parents say that the children do not get as tired of vacation, and both children and teachers are more cheerful about returning to school when they know they are not facing a nine-month term. Further, neither teachers nor children get tired of the school routine before the next vacation.

Parental arguments against a year-round school program take many forms, but they seem to stem from a basic unwillingness to break with a long-established tradition. Some parents dislike the idea of other than summer vacations, and many parents do not want their children at home during the winter, especially in areas where the weather necessitates their being indoors much of the time. Others complain that there are few activities for children that do not cost money. Perhaps they are not willing to search out free activities or to spend their own time doing things with their children.

Some parents fear that their children might be tempted to skip school if their friends are out on vacation, and also that neighborhood vandalism might rise if there are always children out of school. These fears seem to be ungrounded. In Jefferson County, the incidence of truancy and vandalism has not increased in the pilot areas any more than in the rest of the county.

Academically, parents question the effects of possible teacher changes every nine weeks. They question whether the children will feel a part of the school when the whole student body is rarely together. They question whether students will be able to schedule the courses they want and whether the curriculum can really be made into nine-week, non-sequential courses. These are areas that are being studied by the Jefferson County evaluation, along with the effects of cutting the school year from 180 to 172 days, a necessity under the Concept 6 calendar.

The jury is still out, but a recent quote by the Jeffco School Board President may reflect a trend. He said: "What I hear bad (about year-round school) affects parents. What I hear good affects kids."

In designing a year-round school evaluation plan, consideration must first be given to the use to be made of the evaluation findings and then to the publics to whom it will be reported. The academic areas to be evaluated, the integrity of the evaluation procedure, and the depth of the study will be determined by the use to which it will be put.

In Jefferson County, we have had a good deal of controversy over the two-year Concept 6 pilot program. The school board will have to decide whether to keep, expand, or scrap the program largely on the basis of the evaluation data. Thus, the data must be accurate, unbiased, and clearly reported.

The evaluation will be reported to the School Board, the Concept 6 Coordinating Committee, the administration, and the general public. Each of these groups will surely have input as to what the Board's decision should be. Therefore, it was decided at the outset that each sector should be represented on the evaluation team and that people for and against the year-round plan should be included. It is hoped that the evaluation report will thus be credible to all publics when it is reported.

The objective results of test scores will be compared with a control group's scores. The control group will be made up of the part of the county not participating in the pilot program. Baseline data comparing the Concept 6 schools with the rest of the county was gathered prior to the beginning of the pilot program and will be compared with the pilot program data.

In order to be completely objective about the test results, it was decided that the entire battery of county testing would be evaluated. County testing is done in grades K-12 in the subject areas of readiness skills, reading, math, language arts, physical education, health, science, and social studies. A total of 70 tests will be evaluated. The Concept 6 school children are expected to exhibit growth in skills commensurate with the growth in the rest of the county.

In addition, the attendance ratio and the dropout rate at each school will be compared against the baseline data. Neither are expected to increase.

The availability and utilization of bonus learning or intersession courses for enrichment, remediation, and acceleration will be noted, and the use made of the overlapping days peculiar to the Concept 6 calendar will be noted. This data will be evaluated for educational benefit of students. Because there are only 172 days of school attendance in the Concept 6 year, opponents of the program will be studying this data carefully to see whether the children suffer from losing 8 days of instruction or whether the average student seeks out extra instruction in the form of bonus courses.

Subjective data from teachers on the number of objectives mastered in the 3 R's and on the assimilation of kindergarten students into the Concept 6 program will be collected and compiled for evaluation. It is hoped that the district will hire an unbiased firm, free from commitment to the success or failure of Concept 6, to analyze all the evaluation data and prepare the reports. In this way, the credibility of the report can be maintained. Complete data, formulas, and analysis procedures will be available to the public, but the data will be reported in non-technical graphic and narrative format for general use.

As we have no data compiled from the pilot, I can report no conclusions at this time. Our interim report will be filed by August 1975 and the final evaluation will be compiled at the end of the pilot program in August 1976.

Miss Robin Hamilton
Student
Drake Junior High School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

I attend a school in Arvada, Colorado. Our year-round school program consists of three tracks of students who attend school on a 4-month-on--2-months-off schedule, with certain tracks starting during different months. In Jefferson County schools this program is called Concept 6. I find this program exciting and most interesting. I feel there are many advantages and disadvantages to this program. During the execution of this plan I have tried to keep an open mind.

Year-round school is a concept that at first sounds great; but after participating in it, I feel there are problems that I as a student found. Social activities suffer a lot, mainly because the full student body cannot participate in all activities, including sports; if someone is out of school during his sport, he won't be as enthusiastic or willing to trudge back and forth to his school.

On the plan we're on, the number of required school days is just barely met. There is no spring vacation, and other holidays such as Presidents' birthdays are not celebrated; thus the parents who have these days off work are more likely to keep their children out of school on these days. This makes the child miss far too much school work.

There is also a good side of this program. The class size is very much decreased. Teachers also seem to have more time for individual students. Split sessions have been eliminated.

Year-round school has been a new experience for most people and everyone has different views on its outcome.

I Was Recruited as a Year-Round School Superintendent (Twice!)

William Rutter
Superintendent of Valley View Public Schools
Romeoville, Illinois

Chronology of events leading to year-round education in Valley View Public Schools:

1. Spring of 1971 an organizational committee of citizens was formed to split the high school district. There was a desire to unify area schools, K-12. There also was frustration over inability to pass a bond referendum for a needed high school.
2. Presented petition of more than 4,000 signatures to old High School Board, requesting it present the petition to the County Board of School Trustees.
3. Old High School Board agreed to present request.
4. Several referenda for a new high school and additional tax monies had failed. Old area seemed to be glad to be rid of the responsibility.
5. After a public hearing, the County Board of School Trustees voted to allow the split on the basis that the newly created high school district would be able to support the referendum and tax increase.
6. Committee of seven was organized and made itself available with the following platform: referendum for a new high school; increased educational tax rate; expanded curriculum; support of co-curricular activities; year-round school; and formation of a unit district as soon as legally permissable.

Personal Comment: At this particular time, while principal of the then Lockport West High School, I had mixed emotions as to the pending split in the high school district. First of all, I had long-standing association with the old high school district as a teacher and administrator. Also, there was the prospect to me, personally, that the County Board of School Trustees would not authorize the splitting of the high school district since the trend statewide had been quite the opposite during the past ten years.

There was also the question of whether this particular technique of reorganizing a school district had a sound legal basis. Professionally, there were two anxieties that I had. One was related to the ambitious program that the split committee had adopted as its platform. Having experienced a historically non-responsive and non-dynamic Board of Education, I had questions about the ability of the area to accomplish the things set forth in its program platform. The other anxiety I experienced was the fact that year-round school had not been instituted in any high school, to my knowledge, and there was no reservoir of information to fall back on in the planning of such a program.

7. Committee first contacted me, who was then high school principal, in late spring of 1971 to discuss my feelings about the split. The outcome of these discussions was that I would be appointed superintendent of the newly formed high school district. The conditions of this agreement were predicated on:
   a. The seven-man committee being elected to the board.
   b. The high school would not go on year-round school until July 1972. Since the underlying Valley View had been on year-round program for two years, it was the original intention of the high school board candidates to push for the year-round program for 1971-72 school year. At this time, Mr. Verne Crackel, former Deputy State Superintendent, conducted a study within the district and supported my recommendation to the board candidates that it would be impractical to institute a year-round school program in the high school on such short notice. It was my recommendation that while we could accomplish this goal, the hurried introduction of the year-round school, 9-12, would have long-lasting negative affects. We agreed that a minimum of 15 months was needed for staff preparation and curricular modification.
   c. That the two school districts, high school and elementary, would work closely with the intention of becoming a unit district, K-12, as soon as legally permissable. To support this goal, the following models of operation were agreed to: The Boards of Education would hold joint meetings (three members in common); policy actions would be acted on by both boards; business actions would be administered through one office; district level administration would work together jointly; and as many support services as possible would be combined.

Personal comment: To me, this relationship was unique in the annals of education in Illinois and, again, I had many reservations about the process. I had never seen two boards of education agree on anything completely, especially when they had separate autonomy. However during the transitional period, this process was accomplished and the board meetings were quite successful. Each board organized its own agenda and ultimately during the course of the meetings acted on and voted on each action and items separately. The cooperative spirit and relationship between the two boards was amazing and served to give me encouragement that the process that they were trying to accomplish would, in fact, be successful.

During the several months that transpired while this process was going on, we were successful in cooperating in many activities. However, the major responsibility for establishing the separate high school district and negotiating the division of assets between the old high school district and the newly formed high school district became my responsibility. This, too, was unique and different. The magnitudinal process of establishing the high school district was accomplished with no additional personnel and no money to speak of. The major assets that we had at this time was ignorance of what we were doing and a real dedicated secretary to help me blunder through this. It was a period of rapid learning and initial accomplishments that we made served to reinforce our confidence and build hope that we would succeed in our efforts.

d. The new high school district would immediately propose a referendum for $8.2 million for a high school building and remodeling of an old building; and .53 per $100 AV educational tax rate increase--largest in the history of Illinois (there were many doubters).

8. In July 1971 the new high school board was elected and seated. After the legally authorized split was accomplished, we again engaged in new and untrod territory through the negotiation of the splitting of assets between the two districts. This turned out to be a prolonged process through weekly negotiation sessions, and most of the terms of the split were agreed upon. However, we ultimately had to submit several monetary items to the County School Board of Trustees through an open hearing, and its attorneys and representatives made the monetary awards. I'm not sure to this day that everything that transpired during that time was legal. However, we survived.
9. On August 28, 1971, the referendum was passed.
10. The board agreed to high school staff inservice and input for the implementation of year-round, 9-12, program (financial commitment of $60,000+).

    There were two major goals. One was to adopt existing program to year-round program. The other was for curricular development and improvement.

    To support the process of adopting existing program to a year-round program, the following technizues were required: scheduling consultants; recommended inside curricular consultants; visitations to year-round schools by staff; department committee for input on problems and concerns; staff/administrative committee to make final program decisions for administration and board approval; and district level personnel from both districts in on all decisions.

    The following was involved in curricular development and improvement: freedom created "pie-in-the-sky" syndrom; many decisions made did not contribute to implementation of year-round school programming; timetable was established for year-round, 9-12, program by July 1972. This schedule was met through the efforts of a lot of people.
11. The State Office of Education conducted a unit district feasibility study. Petition was then filed for the formation of a unit district in the spring of 1972.
12. A special election for the formation of a Unit District was held in April 1972. Two boards were abolished as of June 30, 1972.

Personal comment: Another unique circumstance existed at this time which caused us to look over our shoulder. However, we again survived this period of time. Officially there was no Board of Education to oversee the district. The County Superintendent appointed a ten-member committee which served as the committee to supersede the unit district formation as an interim committee to oversee the district. Technically there was no official body to which the administration was responsible for about a 30-day period. All actions taken during that time and some of the action previously taken had to be adopted and acted upon after the Unit District Board of Education was duly elected and seated.

13. Unit District Board election was held July 22, 1972, and the Board was seated on July 27, 1972.
14. On July 27, 1972, an organizational meeting of the Unit District Board was held. (The name of the new district was Valley View Community Unit School District #365U).

15. On July 30, 1972, year-round, K-12, program started in District 365U.
16. Previous superintendent, District 96, became superintendent of unit district on July 27, 1972; I served as deputy superintendent. My major duties: oversee 9-12 year-round program; head up high school building program, prepare building referendum for K-8 buildings and tax rate increase which was passed on; handle general administrative assignments; handle everything connected with a second major referendum for eleven school buildings and a .35 educational tax rate increase which was passed during this period.
17. During June 1973, while the Board of Education was making an administrative change, I became interim superintendent.

Personal comment: Again this served as a period of time for me to make some personal commitments and decisions. Having gone through the implementation of a year-round school program at the high school level, the split of the district, the organization of a separate high school district, and the amalgamation of two previously existing districts, I certainly had the opportunity to back out of the picture had I chose to do so. I cannot say that this period of time was a relaxing period in my life, but I can say that it was an exciting period in my life in terms of accomplishments. So with this in mind, I decided to stay in the picture and made application for the superintendency of the district.

The Board of Education opened the superintendency to internal candidates plus all candidates from the outside through a screening agency. This process took approximately six months, during which time I was interim superintendent. I had to go through the interview application process like all the other final candidates, and this process served to confirm my commitment to the district.

18. In January 1973, I was appointed superintendent for the second time. I accepted the superintendency with the full knowledge and awareness of the problems that faced the district.
19. Since June 1973 we have implemented a K-8 continuing, routine 45-15 program. We dealt with track balancing, staffing decisions for K-8, and the initial concessions that were made to bring about acceptance of the year-round program. These concessions related to staffing ratios, contractual lengths of time, and aide determination. It should be noted that the 9-12 initial scheduling problems took two years to resolve.

Positive outcomes of our year-round education program are:

1. Approaching the sixth year, the community support is as strong as initial support;
2. Majority of staff is supportive;
3. Building use is approaching maximum;
4. Construction saving experienced;
5. Learning has not decreased;
6. Continuing support for tax referenda;
7. Possible to deliver full implication of the theory with proper planning and management.

Problem areas of the program are:

1. Track balancing, K-12;
2. Adjustment to staffing patterns that were initially committed to at the start of year-round school;
3. Over-reaction and desire to modify curriculum simultaneously with year-round school;
4. Multi-tracking, K-12
5. Low-incidence courses, 9-12;
6. Contractual arrangements with staff.

Recommendations to districts entering year-round programs are:

1. Initial goal should be community understanding and acceptance. Newly established communities and younger populations tend to be more adaptable.
2. Staff understanding and acceptance through participation.
3. Maximum contract length of 225 days.
4. Administrative adjustment to continuous cycle, including preparation of schedule, testing, class meetings, school assemblies and no breathing time.
5. Do not engage in curricular adjustment and programs that are required by 45-15 other

than those you would normally do.

6. Dialogue with other agencies, including recreational agencies, library, Scouts, and church programs.
7. Cash flow and money management.
8. Building maintenance can be adjusted from normal good maintenance plan.
9. Prepare for staff accounting.
10. Easy-to-lose resource gained if attention given to building space and number of staff.
11. 15-day cycle for transportation and food service support services are all manageable with good planning.

Personal comment: If I had to do it over again, I would have no reservations about entering this dramatic process. For me personally, it has been rewarding and beneficial; but more important, I think I have been able to contribute to some constructive decisions for students. It has not been without frustrations, but this is very typical of all administrative positions in growing school districts. I wouldn't exchange it for anything.

How We Did It Sessions

Change--Traditional to Continuous Calendar

Delaine T. Richards
Principal of El Camino Real School
Irvine Unified School District
Irvine, California

The major problem to overcome in the minds and attitudes of people with the introduction of something different is basically change itself. No matter whether it be a change in life-style, or a change in the weather, it causes varying degrees of comment and/or even trauma to some individuals. To others, change may be a challenge or motivation for improvement, for renewed interest or for the chance to do something different.

However, in many cases, the immediate reaction to change is a "red flag" and immediate "opposition." Regardless of the rationale or the facts that may be evident, if a mind set is already developed, it can become next to impossible to prove otherwise. Consequently, people must be made as knowledgeable as possible before negative opinions are developed. The immediate task then is to make the change from traditional to continuous calendar as subtle and factual as possible.

Being aware of this, the administration of the El Camino Real School and those staff who were definitely interested in the year-round calendar concept spent many hours with meetings, both large and small groups, coffee klatchs in the homes, plus providing and informing parents and community leaders with as much information as possible through dissemination of research and visitations to programs currently in operation.

Several individuals from the community became the nucleus for informing the majority of the community regarding the year-round calendar. The community leaders and staff worked vigorously to make it known that there were positive aspects to the calendar as well as possible negative aspects. We tried not to work in the realm of innuendos, half-truths or to make promises that could be construed as factors that possibly could be used negatively in the future. We were not afraid to say that, "We didn't know all the answers."

There was a possible express advantage of being on double sessions, whereby, some parents were looking for alternatives. Prior to the presentation of the El Camino Real School proposal for the year-round calendar, communities and/or staffs had rejected the concept in fourteen other schools in the district.

When a vote was taken, the number of students committed by their parents to at least enroll in the year-round program upon its inception on July 7, 1972, was almost two to one over those desiring the traditional calendar at this particular school.

With the information mentioned, the proposal of an all-year calendar adopted at El Camino Real School came before the Board of Education on March 15, 1972. At this particular time, the parent community presented a petition with 747 signatures supporting the year-round calendar concept. With this petition and the enthusiasm of the parents and staff, the Board authorized the beginning of a year-round calendar program, "modified 45-15", at the El Camino Real School for the school year 1972-73 with the following stipulations:

1. Irvine Elementary School, located adjacent to El Camino Real School, would remain on a conventional school calendar.
2. Only volunteer students would be placed on the "45-15" plan, including those students moving in during the 1972-73 school year.
3. Students would be allowed to transfer out of the "45-15" program to the conventional school, if desired.
4. Double sessions would be considered for all schools on the basis of not overloading one school because of this particular program.
5. The Board would receive a report each month on the problems encountered and advantages gained.

In addition, it was stated that the year-round school program was to cost no more than any comparable school program in the district.

With minimal support from both district administration and the Board of Education, El Camino Real School became successful with its student body reaching a point where enrollment had to be closed because of limited facilities. At that time, a waiting list was established which grew to approximately 100 students during the 1973-74 school year. Because of the waiting list and interest expressed by parents, another school was opened beginning with the 1974-75 school year. This school currently has an enrollment of 600 K-8 students and El Camino Real School continues to have a waiting list of approximately 50 students.

Due to the enthusiastic support of approximately 20 percent of the students in the district enrolled in a year-round program, the district is currently studying the option of providing an alternative at the high school level for a form of an extended, continuous year calendar.

Parents and students of the community are interested in having the alternative of a K-12 continuous calendar available to them so that they may keep their students and their life style in a compatible format. I feel it is very important that the community be given the option of alternative calendars and life styles as well as alternatives in the curriculum for their students. Given the opportunity to make this choice, the growth of the continuous all-year calendar appears inevitable. True, it does not meet the criteria for every parent's life style, but there are those who have discarded the idea that the agrarian life style of the traditional calendar gives them the opportunities that they desire for their vacation periods. On a recent survey, March 14, 1975, with 72.5 percent of the families responding, 94.8 percent of the families attending El Camino Real School indicated that the year-round school calendar was satisfactory for their family.

We have found in our community that parents and students are enthusiastic about the shorter breaks spread throughout the school year rather than one large continuous break during one period of the year. We have enhanced these shorter breaks with, what we believe to be, one of the most successful and outstanding intersession programs that we have been able to find. The enrollment has consistently been over 50 percent of the students eligible for the intersession program for two of the three- or four-week vacation periods.

The types of programs that have been offered to these enrollees have been most stimulating and exciting to them. Parental support as volunteers in this program, as well as the total school, has been outstanding. This enthusiastic support is very evident by the fact that over 80 volunteer parents are active in the school's program.

In conclusion, it is evident that with the proper motivation, positive change can take place with a large segment of the community. One factor to success is involvement, but the real key is one thing and one thing only--TRUST!!

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION IN SUNNYSIDE: A SOUND/SLIDE PRESENTATION

Dr. Patrick Henderson
Superintendent of Sunnyside School District 12
Tucson, Arizona

Sunnyside School District is located in Tucson, Arizona, It is partly urban and partly suburban and has experienced growth at a phenomenal rate. The district had approximately 6200 students in K-12 in 1970, and by 1973 the enrollment had increased to almost 11,000 students. The district was bonded to maximum capacity and could not build facilities. During the 1973-1974 school year, there were over 2200 students on double sessions with no hope of reducing the number of students who would continue to come into the district and need to be put on double sessions.

In 1971, the Board of Education determined that student growth was going to be rapid, so it directed the administration to conduct a feasibility study in an attempt to identify what the year-round schedule would do for the district in terms of facilities and personnel.

A committee consisting of parents, teachers, and administrators was appointed to make the study, and a report was submitted to the Board of Education in January 1972. Following a review of the report, the Board of Education immediately began to involve the community by conducting public meetings at each school within the district and by soliciting feedback from constituents. A great amount of printed literature was also being sent to all residents in the district.

After a full year and a half of holding meetings throughout the district, the Board of Education determined that of the alternatives available, the year-round schedule seemed to offer the best opportunity for the greatest number of students to obtain a quality education and be able to attend on a regular daytime schedule.

At a regularly scheduled meeting held in June of 1973, the Board of Education adopted a resolution directing the administration to move toward implementing the year-round schedule beginning on July 1, 1974, and using the 45-15 schedule. The balance of 1973 and during the early months of 1974, the administration conducted numerous meetings and luncheons with constituents and sent out over one million pages of 8 1/2" by 11" printed materials to parents and staff attempting to help them obtain a clear understanding of how the year-round schedule would be implemented, and how it would work.

On July 1, 1974, the first 2,700 students arrived. Teachers and administrators stated that it was the smoothest opening of school that they had ever witnessed. The concept of the year-round schedule has been extremely well accepted by parents, students, and staff. Following eleven months of operation, the superintendent's office has received only three written complaints about the year-round schedule and no more than a half dozen telephone complaints.

One would need to conclude that with hard-working, committed administrators, teachers, and staff, the community has accepted and is adapting to the new schedule. The district is now preparing schedules for the second year of operation.

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL PROGRAM K-12

Dr. William D. White
Director, Instructional Planning and Development
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

The year-round school program was initiated July 30, 1974, in the Jefferson County Public Schools, Lakewood, Colorado. Sixteen of the 112 schools in the district are involved. These 16 schools have a combined enrollment of more than 13,000 students.

Concept 6 was put into effect after nearly three years of study and planning by parents, students, teachers and school administrators. Under Concept 6 the school year is divided into six terms. Students attend two consecutive 43-day terms, vacation for one term, and then keep repeating this pattern.

Key features include the option for all children in a family to be on the same attendance track regardless of grade level, preservation of existing quality teaching methods, opportunity for enrichment or remedial instruction during vacation periods, and more economical use of existing school buildings which traditionally are not used three months of the year.

The program will receive a two-year trial and will be evaluated annually by the Jefferson County Board of Education. If it proves successful it could be extended to other schools in Jefferson County.

Between January 1974 and March 1975, students were allowed to select Track A, Track B, or Track C. Since March 15, 1975, however, school principals have been given authority to assign tracks to new students. This is being done to provide equal educational opportunities for students in all three tracks. New students who have a brother or sister who was enrolled prior to this date will, to maintain family unity, be permitted to select their track.

The usual plan is for the student to attend four of the six terms during any one 12-month period. But depending on the availability of space and the needs of the student, the opportunity is available in some schools for attendance at a fifth term.

Another educational feature of Concept 6 is the Bonus Learning Session. These are enrichment sessions on various topics which range in length from one day to several weeks. These Bonus Learning Sessions are scheduled during vacation periods and attendance by students is strictly voluntary.

Special Concept 6 advisory committees have been established in both the Arvada West and Columbine areas which are both on year-round scheduling. These committees, comprised of parents, students and school staff members, offer advice and act as a community sounding board. A central committee comprised of members from the two area committees helps coordinate and evaluate the Concept 6 program.

For more information about Concept 6 you may contact the Office of Information Services, Jefferson County Public Schools, 1215 Quail Street, Lakewood, Colorado 80215.

SOME DO'S AND DONT'S

1. Pilot year-round programs should be small rather than large. There are too many adjustments to be made which vary from school to school for a large number of schools to be supported right off.

2. The principal and key staff members in the pilot school should be the chief spokesman for the program. No district level spokesman can have sufficient credibility with each local school community. Principals need the freedom to adapt the plan to their operation.

3. Community opposition is certain but local staff support and a well informed citizens advisory committee are the keys to success.

4. Curriculum revision is not a major problem if the school is familiar with the quarter organization and scheduling of courses at the secondary level.

5. Rumor is the greatest enemy of a school planning to operate year-round. An active local school information plan is essential.

6. An evaluation plan which compares pre-pilot data with current pilot school data has many difficulties. So many adjustment factors must be added from one year to the next it clouds the results.

7. Budgets for pilot operations should be clearly justified. There is a tendency for spending authorities to ask for more than they need to get the job done.

8. Arena scheduling procedures seem to be the best approach at the junior and senior high levels.

TIME-LINE FOR PLANNING, PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CONCEPT 6

	Start	Finish
Develop an orientation and inservice program for principals of pilot schools	6-18-73	9-7-73
Preparation of a series of newsletters to provide uniform information on Concept 6 in layman's language. This means will be used to inform the public until final agreement is reached on data for a handbook.	6-18-73	1-1-74
Formulation of Citizens Advisory Committees and Central Coordinating Committee	8-6-73	9-21-73
Establish teams of staff and administrators for curriculum study and revision	9-1-73	1-1-74
Establish teams of counselors, administrators and district level staff to develop and revise administrative policy and procedure for year-round operations	9-1-73	1-15-74
Determine research design and monitoring agent	9-15-73	1-1-74
Study air conditioning needs of all pilot area schools	8-7-73	10-1-73
Develop scheduling procedures	9-1-73	1-1-74
Adopt and publish revised curriculum based on 43-day units of instruction	9-1-73	1-1-74
Adoption of the year-round Concept 6 calendar	9-1-73	9-21-73
Decisions regarding contracts, salaries, methods of determining length of work year	9-1-73	11-1-73
Decisions concerning staff reassignments, additions, and special allocations	11-1-73	4-15-74
Personnel assignments 1. Number of classroom teachers allocated by grade level and subject for each pilot school 2. Number of specialists to be assigned to each school and each pilot area 3. Within the framework of each school, principals should designate the period of time each classroom teacher will be under teaching contract	1-1-74	4-15-74

4. Number and type of classified personnel allocated for the pilot schools

Develop forms for student registration and schedule planning	11-1-73	11-15-73
Get firm information on vacation preferences	1-15-74	2-1-74
Teacher preparation workshops	1-1-74	6-7-74
(Pre-registration - Student Planning Forms Completed)	10-1-73	1-1-74
Determination of transportation services required - assignment of routes	4-15-74	6-7-74
Orientation of maintenance and supply personnel	4-15-74	6-7-74
Prepare custodial schedules	4-15-74	6-7-74
Reporting date for pilot school principals	7-15-74	
Reporting date for teachers (Tracks B and C) and cafeteria managers	7-26-74	
School opens year-round (Tracks B and C students report)	7-30-74	

Is the Intersession Program for Your School?

Delaine T. Richards
Principal of El Camino Real School
Irvine Unified School District
Irvine, California

An intersession program in the year-round school is comparable to the traditional summer school in terms of function and purpose. It can be a vital part of the total offering of the school. Its uniqueness, however, is evidenced by a number of short sessions and the capability for providing a different program offering or theme during each session.

The planning of an intersession program should involve the school staff. Curricular themes and/or offerings can be of the unique, innovative type which may supplement the regular program. This program can provide an excellent opportunity to introduce some curricular ideas on a short-term basis. If the offering proves worthwhile, it may be incorporated into the regular curriculum. If it is not accepted well by the students and staff, it is not committed for a long period of time and can be discontinued.

When the vacations are three or four weeks in length, we recommend that only two of those weeks be utilized for an intersession. This necessitates the students having a minimum of a week break from the educational program. The length of the school day can be flexible, depending upon the school and district needs. We have used a minimum 240-minute day since this qualified for full ADA reimbursement in California. The total length of the day may vary from the four hours to considerably longer if the activity includes a long field trip or other type of excursion.

To insure consistency in the intersession a coordinator should be appointed whose main responsibility is to plan, coordinate, and administer the program throughout the year. The totality of the responsibility of this individual will be dependent upon the enrollment in the intersession. If there is a continuous enrollment of over 100 students, the coordination and planning can be more than a one-half-time job.

In an on-going year-round program, housing must be provided that will be available at all

times. Depending upon the availability of space and the size of enrollment, a facility should be designated specifically for the intersession. Furniture, equipment, audio-visual materials and supplies should be made available on a permanent basis.

Enrollment for each session will determine the amount of staff that will be required. We would highly recommend a pre-registration so that there is some indication of the staff that may be needed, utilizing a student/adult ratio of 30 to 1. A minimum of one certificated person is required plus the number of aides necessary to carry out the program. The larger the enrollment the more staff that will be necessary, including additional certificated personnel. If the coordinator of the program is not one of the teachers, then it is highly recommended that one other staff member be maintained on a continuing basis to provide continuity in the classroom.

It is necessary to make the curriculum exciting, interesting and educational so that it will generate the enrollment necessary to carry out a good program. The more appealing the offering, the larger the enrollment will be. Field trips, excursions and various types of interesting educational activities are a must to retain the students in attendance.

Once the curriculum has been planned, the coordinator of the intersession program will need to publicize the curriculum to the students so pre-enrollment may take place. To generate interest for enrollment in the intersession, the presentation of the curriculum offering to the students should be done the week prior to opening. It should be presented to the students personally by someone who can give an enthusiastic, dynamic, clear and easy-to-understand picture of what is to happen, including the highlights of the offering.

Attendance of students in the program is a vital prerequisite for generating the funds necessary to finance the program. With careful planning, the budget may be figured on a per-student per-day allocation so an ongoing awareness of funding is available. In California, the funding at this time for intersession is adequate to carry on an outstanding program. Realizing that in some states funding is strictly at the local level or is assessed each student in the program, budget is the determining factor as to what kind of program that can really be implemented. With adequate financial resources available, the success of the program is entirely dependent upon the enthusiasm and quality of the staff and curriculum being offered. If finances are limited, then the staff and curriculum will be somewhat curtailed.

Clerical time will be needed to handle the development of materials, bulletins and registration of students. With a small enrollment this may be done by the local school clerical staff. However, if the enrollment is substantial, additional clerical assistance will be needed just for intersession. In our case, salaries for all staff, including certificated, are paid on an hourly basis so that the program may be expanded or limited depending on resourses available.

In the final analysis, the success or failure of the intersession program will depend basically on funding, but the enthusiasm of the staff and the presentation of the curriculum is an important factor. With careful planning and selection of personnel, regardless of funding, an adequate program may be carried on for those students who desire an exciting education opportunity during their vacation period.

The Irvine Unified School District has developed a monograph available at cost titled, "Intersession Program Development and Curriculum Units." It includes a detailed description of process and procedure for development of the program and a number of curriculum units for a two-week intersession program. This may be obtained by writing El Camino Real School, Irvine Unified School District, 4782 Karen Ann Lane, Irvine, California 92705.

"A Tale of Four Cities"

Martin Rubinstein
Director, Department of Support Programs
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

On August 14, 1969, the Dade County School Board authorized the Division of Instruction to conduct a plant utilization study. The study was to have as its purpose the exploration and recommendation of alternate plant utilization plans for the most efficient use of Dade County School facilities so as to reduce the need for capital expenditure during the next five years. The recommendations which evolved from the study were expected to maintain the present level of instruction and, where feasible, provide an opportunity for the improvement of the educational program while still effecting plan economies.

Two plant utilization strategies became apparent as the study progressed: The extended school day and the extended school year. The second plan, extension of the school year, while considerably more difficult to implement, offered far more promise in terms of education excellence. A recommendation of the plant utilization study proposed a five-year program for development and implementation of a year-round school plan for Dade County Public Schools. This program would include: 1. Revision and restructuring of curriculum; 2. Revision of pertinent local policies and regulations; 3. Requests for waivers or changes of pertinent state regulations and accreditation standards; 4. A campaign to inform the public about the plan; 5. Maximum involvement of school system staff at all levels.

Seven extended school year plans, all of which were considered as being impractical for implementation in Dade County, were reviewed. The experiences of other school systems indicated that the following criteria had to be considered prior to the development of an extended school year program for the Dade County Schools:

1. The extended school year design that produces the greatest plant utilization benefit requires the greatest adjustment in living patterns and such designs have proved least acceptable to communities at large.

2. Extended school year designs that mandate specific vacation periods to pupils are not as acceptable to communities as those extended school year programs that are voluntary in nature.

3. Extended school year designs that demand a radical departure from existing school calendars are not accepted by communities as well as those extended school year plans that require only slight calendar changes.

4. The extended school year plan that increases the students' options of course selection, attendance sessions and vacation options are more acceptable to students and patrons than those plans which maintain present restrictions in the areas of curriculum, attendance and vacation periods.

On the basis of the above criteria, the quinmester plan, which is designed around a calendar that divides the school year into five 45-day or 9-week sessions, was developed by the Division of Instruction and recommended to the Dade County School Board for piloting in selected secondary schools.

In 1971, five secondary pilot schools were established. The function of these schools was essentially to field test quinmester curriculum and to develop administrative guidelines to facilitate the implementation of the program. In 1972, the program was expanded to nineteen secondary schools and has continued to expand until the present time when all of the Dade County secondary schools are operating on the quinmester program.

It should be noted that adoption of the quinmester program by a secondary school does not imply that the school will operate during the summer quinmester since selected schools are chosen to operate each summer. The schools operating during the summer are required to

enroll students from other secondary schools. This procedure requires the establishment of a unique feeder pattern and transportation plan for each summer quinmester. The enrollment in the summer quinmester represents approximately 25 percent of the secondary population and has increased each summer by approximately 30 percent.

In the last two years, seven elementary schools have piloted an elementary quinmester program which is significantly different in organization and format than the secondary quinmester program. The number of pilot schools has been expanded to 39 starting with the summer quinmester, 1975-76.

Ms. Chris Short
Teacher
Mollela Grade School
Mollela, Oregon

Like so many other districts, we were wealthy back in '71. It was not money, but a wealth of problems brought on by overcrowding that gave us our numerical headache. The parents and a few stray voters turned down a couple of building programs.

"What now?" we lamented. Yet all was quiet for another year while our problems grew and our facility shrank. The Board deliberated with a couple of alternatives--split shift or year-round school. The idea of a double shift came barbed with everyone's worst fears of a change in education. Needless to say any other idea was worth investigating.

So that other radical concept of school scheduling was quietly let in the back door. Year-round education went through our own version of Consumer Report's labratory tests. We examined her in all her forms. Finally the Board concluded by some unexplained insight that if cutting the school in two for a double shift was unacceptable, then dividing it into fourths would be better. And we launched our 1,100 students into a quarter system.

Our only problem, in short, was Oregon. Our lovely liquid winters did not excite our parents or their babysitters when they considered that they, not the teachers, would have their children indoors for three months. With another flash of brilliance the Board came to its current conclusion: split shift is bad, and four quarters have problems, then maybe 45-15 is what we need.

This time the change was easier. At least we were familiar with many of the potential problems and comfortable with the advantages of year-round education. We're about to celebrate our fourth anniversary of year-round school--our second at 45-15--and things are looking good for next year.

The moral of this story is: One traditionally expects company at the front door. But often one's best friend comes through the back door.

Dr. Wesley Apker
Executive Secretary
National Association of State Boards of Education
Denver, Colorado

At Evergreen School District, Vancouver, Washington, ad hoc lay committees were convened between 1970-73 to study the potential of year-round schools. The 1972-73 committee narrowed the choices to the Jeffco Concept 6 or the 45-15 plans. The 1973-74 committee was given the following tasks by the Board of Directors in September:

1. Review the current literature;
2. Review the work of previous committees;
3. Review in-depth the Jeffco Concept 6 and 45-15 plans and recommend one;
4. Cost out the implementation of the plan and recommend a target start date;
5. Develop arguments for and against the plan plus a full information packet;
6. Hold public hearings;
7. Recommend the mechanism for determining the public will.

By December 1974 they had completed tasks one thru five. Hearings were held at the end of January thru the first two weeks in February. The ballots were in by the end of February.

Their recommendation of the 45-15 was after on-site visits, presentations by staff concerning such a plan, and review of video tapes, films and slides.

Their informational packets for the public hearings were drawn from their studies. The information was biased in favor of the year-round school.

Cost data were developed by two engineers basing their cost calculations on available information from other districts and slide rule extrapolation to the Evergreen School District.

Balloting was limited to those who attended a hearing or who requested an informational packet; a 60 percent yes vote was required to trigger implementation.

Weaknesses found were:

1. Too little curricular program impact was studied;
2. Cost estimates were gross at the best;
3. Instructional staff and education association involvement was too limited;
4. The balloting process created resentment from those who could not ballot.

Identifying the Background Conditions of a Specific Community in Order To Tailor a Year-Round School Plan to that Community

Dr. John D. McLain
Director, Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania
Director, Education Development Center for Year-Round Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
and
Treasurer, National Council on Year-Round Education

There are three major factors that need to be considered in planning school programs, whether it be year-round education or other major changes in the school's operation. These are: (1) the quality of education and the impact of the change on that, (2) the economic efficiency or cost of the change compared to the cost of other alternatives, and (3) the effect the change would have on the life styles or value systems of the people concerned.

The people concerned are the taxpayers, the professional educators, the parents and the students.

Usually, if the people concerned are able to examine the issues as they relate to these three broad areas (quality of education, economic efficiency and life styles), they can come up with a reasonable solution. They want quality education but will sacrifice some quality for economy or convenience. They want to keep taxes down but will pay for the educational programs that are really needed. They want the school schedule to suit their convenience but will sacrifice some convenience to get the schools they need at a price they can pay.

I do not mean to oversimplify this problem. Different people are affected in different ways. These are value judgements and consensus is not easily attained. The end result frequently is in the form of a compromise. Usually, there is no way to deal with social problems and make everybody happy.

How these problems are dealt with in a community depends to a great extent upon the skills of the professional leaders of the community--and this is where we come in--whether we are the hired school administrators, the teachers, the elected school board members, or the interested parents.

As leaders we have a responsibility of helping the community to pinpoint the needs for change. If the need is to accommodate an expanding enrollment in limited space, one type of program, such as the 45-15 plan, may be a logical solution.

If the recognized need is for greater flexibility in the vacation schedules of individual parents, then maybe the flexible all-year school should be considered.

First of all, then, it is important to clearly define the need or needs to be met by creating a change. If there are no unmet needs, then there should be no change initiated.

Secondly, all available resources and all available ways in which those resources may be used to meet the needs should be examined. It should be recognized that the only way this can be done adequately is to involve in the consideration at least a good sample of those who would be affected by the change--the teachers, the parents, the students, the taxpayers.

Thirdly, in terms of the need or needs, the best alternative approach should be selected.

Finally, plans to implement such change, recognizing the steps necessary to carry out such a program, need to be developed and carried out.

Dr. John W. Washburn, Jr.
Director of Elementary Instruction
Great Neck Public Schools
Great Neck, New York

Any statement of educational goals must inevitably be based upon a philosophy of life, the individual's part in life, and the role of the schools therein. In our society the many views on these matters are translated into differing educational programs with differing emphasis on such matters as the role of the individual, the importance of the acquisition of knowledge, and the relationship of schooling to the larger society.

Differing priorities, reflecting regional differences, may well be determined at local school district levels. There are, however, three goals which are so pervasive that they could be considered goals for all schools: basic skills, knowledge, and values.

Schools need to address themselves, in terms of their communities, to the following: goals, identifying gaps between goals and reality, and closing the gaps. As we move to close the gaps, we must find ways to include the concerns of our communities (parents, local and state agencies, and ourselves).

We are now entering an era in which, in spite of declining enrollments, demands for service are continuing to expand and are becoming more sophisticated and complex. Yet resources are not becoming more available to satisfy these demands. There are other strong competing claims for tax dollars at a time when the public is growing increasingly hostile to increased taxes.

A major task for all concerned with the equality of education is to help develop an informed public that will support adequate resources for education. At the same time, educa-

tion must do all it can to insure that the funds it does get are used efficiently and effectively. This effort must include the continuous search for new ways to provide better services and to provide present services more economically. YRE provides a fresh opportunity for us to achieve these ends.

Initial Planning for Year-Round Education Programs

Dr. Robert H. Williams
Superintendent of Rialto Unified School District
Rialto, California

Far too often educators find themselves in pursuit of new ideas and systems designed to stimulate thinking and to make a show that change has occurred. Far too often these same educators have been caught in the middle of an innovation with their planning "hanging down." In our society today, there is a proclivity to begin where the action is and develop needed plans after the wheels of the expected change have been set in motion. Planners are too frequently looked upon as the stumbling block to progress and then scorned because something went wrong on the way to reaching the hoped-for objectives. None the less, and we've heard this all before, let's take a look at what the "Initial Planner" must do, be it for year-round education or any program involving educational change.

Purpose: Improvement in learning outcomes must be the major reason for introducing new and different programs. Learning outcomes or results are based on what the student does, says, feels or writes as an end product in the cognitive, affective or psychomotor domains. Does your year-round plan provide for learning outcomes?

Guidelines are necessary: Impromptu, sporadic or trial-and-error innovations may have their place in teaching children, youth and adults, but they have a tendency to be either wasteful in student and teacher time or wasteful in money and other resources. Outcomes from innovations instituted by these methods are usually very much in doubt. Students lose when programs fail! How much can you afford in time or money to try your plan?

Steps in Initial Planning: 1. What are the needs to be met?
2. What are the components of the suggested innovation or calendar change?
3. Why is it necessary to change from what you are doing?
4. Do you have the latest research on your type of plan?
5. Does the research stand up to a critical analysis?
6. Why isn't your present program successful?
7. Who will be involved in the change?
8. What are the necessary tasks to be done to accomplish the change? Who will do them?
9. What dollars, "personpower," hours, supplies, materials and housing do you need to accomplish what you want? Have these been budgeted?
10. Have you considered "field testing" or piloting your new schedule on a small scale basis?
11. How will you build a communications component designed to create understanding by students, staff and parents?
12. What channels of support will need to be followed? Students? Parents? Staff? Community? Board? How will they be involved?
13. How will you measure, assess and evaluate the success of your new year-round schedule?
14. What causes you to think that your plan is the "best way to go"?
15. Why did you wait until now to make the change?

Successful "year-rounders" have answered the above questions and have done initial planning. Success has not been by accident. Learning outcomes have been shown. Year-round school, well planned, is good for kids.

Dr. Bruce Campbell
Legislative Officer
New Jersey Department of Education

The surest ways to kill an idea may not be, as we have often professed, to give it to a committee, but rather to give responsibility without commensurate authority and to fail to involve those persons who will be affected.

In establishing a year-round education task force, the same care should be exercised as in any other developmental activity undertaken by an organization. The following points and questions are suggested for your consideration.

1. The assignment to the task force should be clearly stated. Precisely what is the task force being asked to accomplish or produce? Within what limits of time? What resources are available to the task force?

2. Given the scope of the assignment to the task force, what persons and groups have a stake in the outcome? What persons and groups other than those just mentioned might have something to contribute?

3. To what degree should these persons and groups be involved, i.e., should they be granted full participation, advisory powers or a chance to make their views known to the task force? This will require some sensitivity in order to achieve a fair balance while keeping in mind that the ultimate decision usually must be made by a board of education.

These points are stated in such general terms as to promote apoplexy in many administrators. Perhaps the eleventh commandment for education should be, "Thou shalt tolerate ambiquity." Nevertheless, they must remain general; each community is unique. In each community, then, the responses will be different. If considered forthrightly, these points and questions may not be easy to satisfy but neither are they insurmountably difficult. We know this to be so because scores of districts have done so, have established good, working task forces where the miracle ingredient communication has been present and have reaped the benefits.

Establishing Two-Way Communication and Dissemination of Information from the Planning Through the Implementation Stages

Mrs. Joy Christopher
Director, Cherry Creek Demonstration Center for Year-Round Education
and Team Leader, Intermediate Open Space
Cunningham Year-Round Elementary School
Cherry Creek School District 5
Denver, Colorado

Cherry Creek Schools is a suburban school district of almost 15,000 students in the south east section of the Metropolitan Denver area. It covers 114 square miles and is basically a residential community that has averaged an annual growth rate of 11 percent over the past four years and is anticipating a growth rate of about 9 percent during 1975 and 1976. The district has passed two bond issues in the past three years. There are presently three elementary schools - about 2,000 students - on the 45-15 calendar.

It is a community-oriented district with a great deal of staff and community involvement in the decision-making process, so it was only natural that the district would choose a community approach to year-round education. Perhaps this approach could serve as one model for providing two-way communication in planning and implementing a year-round program in a district.

An informational report on year-round calendars in use about the country was presented to the Board of Education in December 1971 and was received by the board as just that - an information report. There was overcrowding in spots within the district, but there were many pupil stations available elsewhere and busing to these schools was a strategy used to relieve that overcrowding.

Cunningham Elementary School on the northern border of the district had experienced chronic overcrowding for several years and many of the children had gone back and forth to other schools more than once in their school careers. In January 1972 the projection for Cunningham's fall enrollment was announced - 1,000 students with a building capacity of 725. The staff and community began a search for solutions.

Planning Stage; In Cherry Creek there is no district position for a school-community relations person...it is a job usually done by principals and teachers within individual schools. The Cunningham principal and staff embarked on its own plan to inform the community the dilemma it faced and the options available to deal with it. The staff recommended a year-round calendar- preferably the 45-15 plan - as the most educationally sound of the options. (Limited bonding capacity prevented a new school as an option at that time, even though the community was supportive of bond issues.)

Members of the PTA Board arranged neighborhood coffees strategically throughout the community with morning, afternoon and evening sessions. The principal and staff members attended these coffees, and there were many heated discussions concerning the various options. The coffees were followed by a large group meeting at the school. It was well attended and featured Mr. and Mrs. Jim Bingle from the Valley View School District in Illinois to answer questions about the 45-15 calendar. They were guests of the PTA. At that meeting the community voted overwhelmingly to support the staff in making its request to implement a 45-15 calendar at the meeting of the Board of Education the following week.

At that Board meeting the principal presented Cunningham's case for a year-round calendar. A staff representative and the PTA president supported him with letters from their respective groups. While the Board was supportive of the concept, it felt more input from the community was necessary and requested that Cunningham conduct a written survey to parents and return with the results the following month. The survey went to the community the next week.

While waiting for the return of the questionnaires the principal invited district personnel - principals, curriculum consultants, food services, transportation services and any interested offices - to a meeting at Cunningham to share the staff and community's thinking about the 45-15 calendar and to explore the ramifications within the district if the Board of Education should approve the plan for Cunningham.

The school received a 93 percent return of the questionnaires with slightly over 72 percent supporting the year-round plan. A committee of parents and teachers met to tally the votes. With that kind of information available, the Board approved implementation of a 45-15 calendar at Cunningham for school year 1972-73 at its regular meeting April 10, 1972.

Implementation: The staff and community again joined forces to have the plan ready by September. Recognizing a special need for communication, the administration released a teacher half-time to work with the community answering questions, both personally and through school communiques to parents and students. A principal's newsletter was begun and is still being published. Staff members worked on a calendar that had to honor holidays already approved in the district calendar. Teachers collected family cards and a parent group divided the community into tracks.

When classes ended in June the faculty remained an additional week to work together organizing into teams and rescheduling curriculum to fit the 45-15 calendar. Cherry Creek has long recognized that the differences in maturity, capability, personality, interests and rate of development necessitate an individualized curriculum regardless of calendar type, and strategies already in use were adequate. Excellence in program is an on-going process requiring constant refinement, but drastic changes were unnecessary.

Team leaders returned again in July to assign children to appropriate classes. At the same time transportation personnel used the community map to chart bus routes and stops. On August 15 school-opening packets were mailed to families and Colorado's first year-round school opened on September 5, 1972.

Expansion: The same basic model of school-community involvement has been used in implementing two more year-round schools in Cherry Creek. Eastridge Elementary School went to its community by way of the coffee cup, and a parent survey yielded enough positive support to implement a 45-15 calendar in July 1973. Mission Viejo Elementary School followed the same route and received enough community support to convince the Board of Education to allow implementation in July 1974.

The community continues to hlep increase communication between parents and school. A Parent-Teacher newsletter goes home on Friday as a track ends and again on Monday as a new track arrives. A principal's newsletter is still being published and mailed to the community as well as other schools in the district and the local news media. The neighborhood coffee is still used as a means of dealing with parent concerns. Track chairmen in the Parent-Teacher Organization arrange meetings between the principal and parents new to the community.

A district-wide study committee with parent, teacher and administrator representatives from each school in the district is presently working to make recommendations about expansion of year-round calendars to the secondary level. But one decision has already been made. If a school chooses to implement a year-round calendar, it will be a school-community decision.

James R. Gove,
Assistant Superintendent of Valley View Public Schools
Romeoville, Illinois
and
President, National Council on Year-Round Education

"We parents won't tolerate Smith as principal. Fire him."
"You can't expel my boy. I'll get a lawyer. I'll fight you in the courts."
"Economize! Stop wasting our tax-dollars on frills."
"Your curriculum is worthless. As a former teacher myself, I demand...

And so the people speak. And if you think this is bad, just try to institute a form of year-round school with taking community support for granted!

Preparing a community for year-round education involves the seeking out and searching in a babel of diversity for the language of cooperation and understanding. There is no single method for developing community support for a year-round school program. There are, though, many methods that can help. Today, I will be providing an indepth explanation of a two-year reporting model for dealing with community involvement and year-round education. I wish to emphasize, though, that in no way, should this model in its entirety be expected to bring about automatic community support for year-round education. It should be looked upon as food for thought when developing your own year-round school-community relations model. In addition, I will be emphasizing some tips for success in winning public support.

The following is a recommended YRE two-year reporting model for preparing a community for year-round education. The reporting activity is followed by the frequency of performance.

Reporting Level--Board of Education and District Administration:

1. Annual Budget Hearing (Annually): YRE compared to 9 months (24 months before); Update YRE compared to 9 months (12 months before).
2. District Communications Council (Monthly): Representatives from each school, PTA's and PTO's.
3. Superintendent's Annual State of District (August of each year): Presented at Board meeting, over local radio and television.
4. Board of Education meetings (Monthly or bi-monthly): Updated verbal and printed YRE reports at each meeting.

5. District Liaison Reporting (Monthly): Between recreation, Scouting, local governments, YMCA's, churches, Federal Government, State Government, state and local Chamber of Commerce.
6. District News Letter (Monthly): Updated YRE information disseminated via U.S. Mail.
7. District Media Council (Monthly): Group discussions, questions and answers about YRE progress with representatives of local news media.
8. Two YRE Brochures (Distributed 15 months before YRE, with updated brochure sent with student assignment mailouts).
9. Coffee Klatches in Parents' Homes (As many as possible).
10. Employee News Letter (Monthly): Updated YRE information.
11. Dial-Into-Education (24 hours per day): Taped telephone message with YRE information.
12. Feed-Back Service Line (24 hours per day): Telephone answering service, questions, name, and telephone number left for call back next day.
13. Community Survey (12 months before YRE and again 4 months before YRE): General district survey about the schools...work in YRE questions...never ask: "Do you want YRE?"
14. Television and Radio (Monthly): Meet the Press programs; update progress reports.
15. District News Releases (Weekly): YRE information.
16. Establish Outside Credibility (As can be generated): Outside visitors to district; state grants; federal grants; private grants.
17. School, Date, and Time Assignments (Just before Christmas and preceeding YRE start-up): With computerized letter signed by superintendent, sent first-class U.S. Mail.
18. District Level Administrators' Meeting (Weekly).
19. District Level and Building Level Administrators' Meeting (Bi-monthly).

The following is a recommended reporting model for school building and classroom use. The reporting activity is followed by the frequency of performance.

1. Building News Letter (Monthly): YRE building information for student to take home.
2. PTA and PTO Meetings (As requested): A "controlled" YRE Road Show presentation.
3. Parent/Teacher Conferences (One per quarter): Teachers must be up to date on YRE.
4. Principal/Parent Conferences (Weekly): Principals communicate by telephone or in person with at least four parents weekly, on <u>good</u> things their child is doing in school. YRE will automatically come up.
5. Open Houses (Semi-annually).
6. Teacher Communications Council (First year--bi-monthly; second year--monthly).
7. Student Communications Council (First year--monthly; second year--as required).
8. Staff Meetings (As required).

The following as some tips for success in a YRE and community relations program:

1. Make sure you have an initial unanimous positive commitment for year-round education from your board of education and the superintendent of schools.
2. Remember that year-round education affects each and every segment of the community.
3. Revise your curriculum only to the extent that year-round education mandates it. Preparing for year-round education is a big enough job unto itself. After this is accomplished, and you feel you have enough time to expand the curriculum, then decide to do so.
4. Remember that the term "involving the community" also includes school custodians, cooks, bus drivers, aides and secretaries.
5. Realize that contained in your employment, and as part of your taxpayers base, are many highly talented individuals. Put <u>them</u> to work! If you feel you need outside consultant help, you will probably realize in a hurry that these types of individuals are most needed to serve as outside prophets. Be careful, though, what they prophesize.
6. Your year-round school calendar should be regarded as a road map to be used not only in determining when children will be in or out of school, but should be used to detect unforseen problems. Develop your road map first.
7. Have available at all times year-round education documents which will lend support to your own research findings and thesis. These publications should deal with external and internal scheduling, cost factors, student achievements, building maintenance, etc.
8. Do not "re-invent the wheel."

9. Never directly ask the community: "Do you want year-round school?"
10. Treat the community as if everyone came from Missouri.
11. Answers to questions should be given in a straightforward and truthful manner. Don't be afraid to say: "I don't know" but, do make sure you get back to them with an answer.
12. "There is nothing to fear, but fear itself." Make sure you listen to these fears and alleviate them.
13. Problems have solutions, disadvantages don't.

Dr. James C. Mounie
Assistant Superintendent of Virginia Beach Public Schools
Virginia Beach, Virginia

The systematic dissemination of information related to the Virginia Beach 45-15 pilot program required a systematic assessment of community understanding and attitudes. Without assurance that the public had been informed and understood the program, reactions to the program could be given no meaningful interpretation.

After the initial phase of the public information effort, Schlechty Associates surveyed all parents whose children were to be in the program. The purpose of the survey was to determine the extensiveness and accuracy of parent information about the pilot program. A total of 1,957 parents (90 percent completed the statistically reliable and valid questionnaire). In general, parents responses indicated that parents were well informed about the concept and the program several months before implementation.

Because of the found level of understanding and because many parents asked that we stop "bombarding" them with information, the decision was made to continue to tone-down and then nearly suspend the effort.

Schlechty Associates, also, conducted a survey of all parents to gather base-line data for a pre- and post-45-15 experience attitude analysis. Parents were asked to respond to a variety of statements designed to provide an opportunity for them to indicate their perceptions of the impact of the 45-15 pilot program on their lives, the lives of their children and the life of the community.

The researchers reported that based on their pre-experience understanding, parents were willing to give the 45-15 program a chance. That atmosphere was the objective of the entire public information effort. The attitude and perception survey concluded that most of the parents felt they had an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns before the program began. The survey reported that 31.1 percent of the parents characterized their attitude toward year-round school as positive, 31.6 percent as negative and 36.7 percent as undecided. After one full year of experience, the post survey of parental attitudes characterized parents as 46.8 percent positive in attitude toward year-round schools, 30.7 percent as negative and 22.5 percent as uncertain. That was a significant and dramatic shift when one considers that no effort was made to "sell" the concept.

In addition to the systematic parent surveys, student and teacher attitude studies and assessment of staff reactions, three public hearings were held to allow for additional subjective in-put. The proceedings for each hearing were recorded and transcribed. Each person who had spoken at the hearings was sent a draft of the proceedings and asked to confirm the accuracy of the representation of their remarks or if not, modify them. Several changes were made; and upon receipt of confirmations, the document "Response" was published. In addition to the usual distribution, copies were presented to each speaker.

Concurrent with the systematic assessment of interest, knowledge and concerns, was the continuation of telephone contacts, media information, and small meetings.

Throughout the planning, operation and evaluation phases of the pilot program, there were constant inquiries and expressions of concern. Perhaps the best commentary on the extent and

accuracy of the two-way communications system in the Virginia Beach program is the fact that since the decision to terminate, not one private or public letter or telephone call supporting or condemning the decision has yet been received.

Planning and Revising Curriculum

Mrs. Mary Milligan
Teacher at Penrose Elementary School
Colorado Springs School District 11
Colorado Springs, Colorado

I. Revision for maintaining sequence in program

A. There is less memory loss due to shorter vacation periods.
B. There are two intersessions as opposed to one summer school for remediation.
C. Student on vacation can audit classes in school.
D. TV Art and Science are put on video tape so classes can see them in correct sequence at any time.
E. Open concept schools -- teams can set up schedules at beginning of year to see when they will team together on units and when separately.

II. Opportunities for innovation

A. New scheduling encourages new ideas.
B. Intersessions and overlaps can be unlimited with regard to variety of programs.
C. There is more liberal funding by administration with a new program.
D. There is opportunity to use new materials and books that haven't been used before.
E. There is greater availability and easier accessibility of IMC materials during summer months.
F. There can be expansion of topics and art work on seasons and holidays not normally found in nine-month calendar.

III. Provision for remediation for students with learning disabilities

A. Intersessions provide two extra times when students can return to school for special help.
B. Students can audit classes during their vacation.
C. There are fewer demands on the time of the student personnel services due to fewer students.
D. Student personnel services are offered on a year-round basis.
E. Students transferring can switch patterns for a more continuous scholastic year.

IV. Scheduling

A. This is definitely more difficult at secondary level.
B. In a team situation, calendar can be set up so that most of the time teachers are teaching the same unit.
C. Math and language arts can be taught at the same time each day.
D. Art, health, science, social studies can be taught at the same time, but not necessarily the same things are being taught.
E. Movies, guest speakers, field trips, etc., can be scheduled for the same time.
F. Noisy versus quiet activities must be schedules for the same times.

Thomas J. McConnell, Jr.
Director, Computer Center
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

The Atlanta Public Schools became involved with the need for automation of student records at about the same time that the Fourth Quarter concept was adopted. Thus, the automated Student System has been developed in parallel with the implementation of the year-round education program. Atlanta has adopted the terminology of Fourth Quarter rather than the YRE nomenclature.

Since original efforts began in 1967, systems development has been accomplished in modules or phases. The first phase consisted of the creation of the Student Master File. This file serves as the hub of activity for all student-related systems and is up-dated on a daily basis. The file currently consists of some one hundred thousand entries since all students are retained in the system on an academic-year basis. At the end of the school year, the students are positively promoted and the file is purged of records of inactive students.

It is impossible to separate our scheduling system from other student-related systems. Thus, discussions here must include mention of other facets of the Student System.

One result of the Fourth Quarter Program was the adoption of a Master Course Offering for the school district. Each quarter, schools have the option of offering a new set of courses from which students are allowed to make course selections. Students make these choices based on a predetermined academic program. A student course request file is then constructed for each school.

On demand, the school can request a simulated schedule, tally and conflict matrix, and associated error reports. The scheduling chairman takes the necessary and required action on this information and file up-dates are made. Other simulated runs can be requested at any time. This process is cylic in nature and schools are generally allowed to iterate through this process for several computer runs. At some point the scheduling chairman determines that the input is acceptable and decides to request schedules.

The Scheduling System builds each school a Proposed Master Schedule. The school uses this as a starting point for building the Quarter Master Schedule. Some modifications and adjustments are made, rooms are assigned and the teacher identification number is associated with each section to be taught.

At this point the school has decided that it will go with a live scheduling run. Individual student schedules are produced on two-up three-part forms. One set (two schedules) are card stock, the other sets are multi-colored paper stock. Dissemination of these forms are at the prerogative of the school and each school has its own rationale for distribution.

In addition to the individual student schedules, a great number of reports are produced such as: class rolls, teacher loads, room assignmbnts and the like.

As has been mentioned, the process does not stop with student scheduling. Once scheduling is complete the file is renamed and now becomes the data base for grade reporting purposes. Drop-add forms are pre-printed from this file and are used as turn-around documents. Thus, the individual student record is maintained in an up-to-date status for each student. New individual student schedules are available on demand as are class rolls and most of the other reports.

At grade reporting time the information on these files is used to produce student grade reports. This system also provides the school administrator with a great number of statistical reports on the grade reporting process.

The latest phase to be added to the system is that of a Transcript System. It is now possible to produce individual student transcripts at the end of each quarter. The reports consist of student transcripts, a gum label for the student cumulative folder and also a volume of reports for the counselor and registar.

The GPA, the present quarters schedule, all courses previously enrolled in by the student and the attendance by quarter are all displayed on the transcript in easy-to-interpret format. Student evaluation and program recommendations are generally based on the results of this cumulative student record.

The next phase to be developed will be that of a Guidance and Counseling System. The development process uses all of the phases mentioned above as stepping stones to building a comprehensive Student System.

It is my personal opinion that the adoption of the Fourth Quarter has provided us with the necessary vehicle to develop a comprehensive Student System. Originally, it was necessary to use the computer for scheduling since it was impossible to manually perform the required tasks in the time alloted. Now, since these systems have been phased in and have become operational, it is the general consensus of the administration that it would be impossible to accomplish our educational objectives without this systems support.

The Student System dictates that a large volume of data be collected and maintained in a timely manner. Accuracy and simplicity of the collection process is fundamental to systems design. Thus, a data entry system is of primary importance to systems acceptability and reliability.

The Atlanta Public Schools is totally committed to the use of OMR (Optical Mark Reading) as a data entry system for data collection. This is a very cost-effective means for reliable data gathering. The concept is simple and most applications use turn-around documents wherever possible. The Student System is 100 percent OMR-oriented and not a single data element enters the system by any other collection technique.

Applicable files are up-dated on an overnight basis. This means that transactions would be received for processing and would be accomplished on the second and third shift and results would be dispatched to the school or department the next day.

In summary, the educational process in Atlanta has been positively affected by the development of this Student System. Better recordkeeping means better management tools that can be applied to the education process, and now decisions can be made on more factual and rational grounds than ever before.

Dr. William D. White
Director, Instructional Planning and Development
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

In revising curriculum for a year-round school program it is usually necessary to break the curriculum up into small segments of nonsequential units. This procedure was followed in developing the curriculum for the Concept 6 year-round school program. A budget of $25,000 was authorized for this purpose; however, very little of these funds were necessary in revising the curriculum for this K-12 program. Most of the additional budget funds were spent in developing the intersession program called bonus learning sessions. Teachers, during their regular planning times, were able to revise the curriculum sufficiently well for the implementation of a K-12 pilot program involving more than 14,000 students. The final revision of the instructional program resulted in an open access curriculum, which had the following characteristics:

1. Six entry times per year.
2. A fifth-term attendance option.
3. Partial or full schedule of students each term.
4. Kindergarten entry of each child when he or she is ready. This is established through testing to determine pupil readiness.

Program Design Elements for an Extended School Year Program:

1. Skills instruction based on a continuum of objectives.
2. Multi-age grouping.
3. Individualized teaching strategies.
4. Staff organized into teaching teams.
5. Extensive use of community resources.
6. Coordinated planning with youth agencies.

Methods of Eliminating Constraints of Sequence in a Year-Round Curriculum:

1. Concentrate prerequisite information in one unit offered repeatedly.
2. Operate an open laboratory throughout the year with prerequisite materials available.
3. Offer intersessions during vacation periods with prerequisite material available.
4. Schedule courses in large blocks of time for one quarter. Total emersion of students into required materials.
5. Combine all levels in a single class and individualized instruction.

Educational Benefits Under the Concept 6 Calendar:

1. Kindergarten pupil entry times closer to date of birth.
2. Eliminate the year-long failure.
3. Eliminate the learning plateau in the last quarter of the traditional school year.
4. Facilitate continuous progress plan of education.
5. Optional fifth quarter allows disadvantaged students to catch up.
6. Outdoor Laboratory School and Planetarium programs offered to more students throughout the year.
7. Allow gifted students to explore and/or accelerate.
8. Eliminate time consuming rites of opening and closing school.

Bonus Learning Sessions Provide Opportunities For:

1. Personalized instruction in specific learning areas.
2. Instruction in basic skills--reading, computation tailored to the needs of the individual.
3. Mini-courses related to student interest.
4. On-the-job training.
5. Dramatics, music, and fine arts festivals.
6. Outdoor Education Laboratory experience.
7. Activities sponsored by recreation districts and youth agencies.
8. School-community sponsored service projects.
9. School sponsored foreign travel.

To revise the curriculum for the year-round program, we simply took the existing courses and divided them into quarters. Then we added elective units which teachers believed should be included. Fianlly we developed an introductory quarter course in those programs where prerequisite information or skills were required. Then required units for quarter courses were offered repeatedly throughout the year so students entering at various times could have access to any course regardless of their track assignment. Most of the quarter courses at the secondary level were nonsequential and all were 43 days in length. In Biology the "Web of Life" was required for a student to establish basic literacy in the subject. Then a series of nonsequential quarters are taken before the student qualifies for the advanced units. In American History any unit may be taken in any order.

Dr. Don E. Glines
Year-Round Education Consultant
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

A distinction must be made in planning and revising curriculum for year-round programs between merely getting the old curriculum into new calendars or the old curriculum with some new wrinkles into the new calendar and the effort to completely revise and develop new curriculum options along with new calendars. In other words, some teachers, parents, and students are willing to go into a year-round program if the calendar is a fairly traditional one, such as a group scheduled 45/15 and if the curriculum does not dramatically change. Others want to develop very individualized calendars and very personalized curriculum, which means a fairly extensive revision of what is currently considered curriculum in public schools. In commenting on the four topics suggested for inclusion in this panel, differentiation has been made in each of the four between those planning to maintain a fairly conventional year-round system and those planning to use year-round education as a vehicle toward moving in new directions.

TOPIC I - Provision for Maintaining Sequence in Program

1. It is relatively easy in most situations to maintain the existing sequence in curriculum when a year-round program is adopted. For example, the current thirty-six week chemistry class can be divided into three twelve-week courses. Each course becomes autonomous. Students must take the first twelve-week Chem I before they can proceed to the next twelve weeks for Chem II and then Chem III. The difference is that students can skip a quarter or two, for example, in the year-round program, rather than be forced to take a continuous nine-month course under the old calendar. The school should make sure that each of the Chemistry courses are offered often enough throughout the student's high school career to insure that he can follow a sequence and complete the Chemistry course. It is merely a problem of scheduling. The same kind of illustration could be given for elementary reading, junior high art, or whatever.

2. In new approaches to curriculum, where personalization and individualization takes place, sequence is no problem. Probably 85 percent of what we are now teaching is not sequential anyway. The small amount that still could be considered sequential does not have to be taught in a block of twelve or nine weeks, or taught one year to prepare for the next year. If the program is individualized, students can learn the material in a sequence that fits in with their immediate needs.

TOPIC II - Opportunities in Innovation

1. For those maintaining a fairly traditional year-round calendar and a fairly traditional curriculum, opportunities for innovation exist through revising the existing curriculum--that is, subtracting unnecessary material and adding more current material, or by creating new courses, such as a series of minicourses in English. Further, through intersessions, creative things such as back-packing, oceanography, additional stress on the arts, and individualizing the traditional reading program can be attempted.

2. In the more open year-round calendars, the opportunities for innovation are only controlled by our own lack of creativity and imagination, along with whatever reality situation may exist, in terms of budget and facilities. In other words, creative year-round schools can come up with fantastic changes. For example, the futurists say that we must eliminate departmentalization and teaching of separate disciplined courses as our major approach to learning. We must deal with the whole. Learning is interdependent. Open year-round programs can thus get rid of departmentalization and separate subject teaching in favor of a more comprehensive approach.

TOPIC III - Provision for Remediation for Students with Learning Disabilities

1. In conventional year-round programs, the same Learning Disability Program can continue. The need is to make sure that the schedule does not so interfere with the services of special teachers for the deaf and blind or emotionally handicapped to the extent that it destroys existing efforts. Sometimes, because these programs are small in many districts, when year-round calendars are attempted, the resources are spread so thin that the year-round remedial programs are diluted.

2. In open individualized programs, the opportunities for learning disabled are tremendously enhanced, because efforts are made on a personalized basis to make sure that whatever a student needs, he or she receives. Students with disabilities need continuous assistance. It does not make sense to have them in school nine months and out three months. Therefore, shorter vacation cycles enhance the opportunities to assist learning disabled students. The more flexible the year-round calendar, and the more personalized the curriculum, the easier it is to assist learning disabled students.

TOPIC IV - Scheduling

1. In traditional year-round calendars, the only problem with scheduling relates to size of the school and singleton courses. If a small school has only one fourth year French class of sixteen students and tries to develop a 45/15 calendar, this means that four students are in each track. A class of four becomes impossible in some districts. Therefore, the sixteen must be multiple track as one class, but only twelve are there at any given time; and every three weeks four go on vacation and four come back from vacation. This type of situation obviously raises havoc with the curriculum in a conventional school attempting the year-round program. These problems can be overcome, but it means that the planning and revision of curriculum must take into account these situations. Not all year-round calendars cause such difficulties, but some increase the problems.

2. The more individualized the teaching and learning process in a school, the more personalized the concern about each child and the more flexible and more humane the attitude toward people in a given school. Scheduling does not become a problem because the bugs that do develop are worked out for the best interests of each family. The more traditional, the more group pace, the more rigid the curriculum, the more difficult it is to schedule. Larger schools have an easier time scheduling in the long run than smaller schools because there are more teachers, more sessions, more tracks, more opportunities to eventually fit the student with a program. The smaller school can still work out the curriculum difficulties; but it is harder, for example, to schedule Chemistry in a small high school with only one session of Chemistry traditionally and only one part-time teacher, versus a larger high school of several Chemistry teachers and several Chemistry sessions. The same holds true at the elementary level. However, because of teaming arrangements and because of the generally more flexible possibilities in an elementary building, as well as the greater concern generally that elementary teachers have about kids, the scheduling for curriculum opportunities do not pose the same problems as they do at the secondary level.

EXTENDING THE CLASSROOM K-12 INTO THE COMMUNITY

Dr. E. Curtis Henson
Assistant Superintendent for Career Education
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

One specific advantage of year-round education is the opportunity to expand vocational education and work/study programs offered to students in high schools. Traditionally, vocational education programs had to be restricted to part of the day during the school year with little or no supervision of activities during the summer months since teachers were not on duty.

Communities providing work opportunities are flooded with applicants during holidays and vacation season since this is the only time when both high school and college students are able to work. Frequently the time that students have to work does not coincide with peak needs of industry. For example, the winter tourist season in and around a ski resort or Miami Beach during the winter season do not offer much opportunity for high school students to work since they must be attending school during that time. In both instances, the need for employees subsides during the summer months.

Another restricting point in the traditionally operated schools is that students are relegated to only afternoon, evening, and weekend employment. On year-round education, students have an opportunity to work full-time for prolonged or extended periods such as for a quarter. One student may work full-time for a given quarter with a second student assuming the job during the following quarter, while the first student attends school. Our experiences have shown that this works better in theory than in practice since employers and employees seemingly like to retain the same relationship over longer periods of time. Consequently, the job is split into two parts with one student working for the first half of the day and the second student working the second half of the day. When the student has the option of attending any three quarters or all four quarters, he may participate in academic pursuits for four periods a day for four quarters a year and work the other one-half day which permits him to graduate with his peers.

In Atlanta, during the 1974-75 school year, approximately 3,000 students were enrolled in planned education programs that combine work and study. These students attend regular high school classes, including job-related instruction. They spend one-half day or more in school and the remainder of the school day on the job. Most students work beyond the school day.

Work/study programs are offered to high school students in eight vocational areas designed to help them acquire adequate occupational knowledge and skills to enter the "world of work" as competent employees at least at entry levels. There are many advantages derived from work experiences which enrich the in-school program as well as give the students many advantages from the "real world" which can be realized from year-round education. These advantages greatly magnify the benefits of year-round education.

BUDGET

Dr. Harald Drewes
Geologist for U.S. Geological Survey
Denver, Colorado
and
Member of YRE Advisory Committees at All Levels

I. The Concept-6 YRE pilot program of the Jefferson County School District R-1 is heavily involved in financial evaluation, so our experiences may help other districts with their evaluation problems. Let me begin with three basic thoughts.

   A. First, don't expect our data to be perfectly valid for any other district, for we all have some unique situations, objectives, or solutions. Consequently, learn what you will from others, but consider holding your own evaluation if your community is not initially certain that YRE is what you want.

   B. Secondly, keep in mind that financial evaluation is easier to conduct in principle than in practice if it is to be thoroughly executed. Short cuts and compromises are available; the extent to which these are used must be determined by each community, based on its own blend of reasons for embarking on YRE and on its time-pressure for getting results.

   C. Thirdly, if a community can afford the time to lay plans carefully and to work with the total community in depth, as we have done, one would be wise to begin financial planning as early as possible--ideally even before attempting a pilot program. But if the community has no time to spare in which to solve a space or money problem, one can jump right into YRE and forget many aspects of financial evaluation.

II. In order to explain why we have turned to certain methods of evaluation and to a protracted planning and piloting period, I will briefly point out the conditions and problems of our district, the basis for my views on our solutions, and the position we have reached in our evaluation.

III. Our plan of financial evaluation requires that we collect cost data on all Concept-6 schools over a three-year period for comparison purposes and that start-up costs of Concept-6 plus current building construction costs be kept separate from operating costs.

A. Baseline data has been collected for the last year of operating on a conventional school schedule; it will serve as our yardstick for evaluation. Our baseline cost data comes in two kinds, one kind which I might call "clean data" and the other "dirty data."

1. Clean baseline data is the kind requiring no great effort to collect or no special judgement to be made on allocation, and it covers most of our budget dollars.
2. Dirty baseline data is the kind requiring some extra effort to obtain or some judgement to be made on allocation of costs. All key decisions are reviewed by our YRE committee.
3. The recognition of these two kinds of data has enabled us to "clean up" the data collected during the following years.

B. First- and second-year operating costs under Concept-6 are collected in the same manner as those of the baseline year and certain adjustments are made.

1. An inflation factor must be cranked into the budget data of the two pilot years.
2. All cost data is converted to per pupil costs.

C. Cost estimates of school construction are needed in order to figure the capital expenditures that would have had to be paid to house the extra pupils now accommodated by Concept-6 schools.

D. Start-up costs, related to the implementation of Concept-6 but not to its operation, are separately tabulated. These should be carefully estimated in advance for, in certain circumstances, they could be considerable. However, our district was fortunate.

1. Our curriculum change-over costs were essentially nil because, independently of Concept-6, we were on, or were to be on, a 9-week curriculum package by the time that the pilot program started.
2. Air conditioning costs were reasonable because many schools were already so equipped, and many others had forced air heating that was easy to modify.
3. Remaining start-up costs were mainly for administrative planning, programming, public information efforts, and evaluation.

IV. While it is too early for us to make any final budget comparisons--the before and after Concept-6 costs per pupil--we have learned several lessons.

A. YRE should be faced as a potential solution to a community problem, not basically as a problem itself.

B. In selecting a YRE plan for your community, keep clearly, but not inflexibly, in mind your objectives and constraints.

C. If a financial objective is important, lay plans early for appropriate evaluation.

D. Expect your chief savings to come from a reduction in capital expenditures.

E. The greater the freedom of choice in your plan, the less probable will savings be. Mandated plans save the most, so freedom of choice may have to be treated as a luxury item.

F. Keep evaluation as current as possible and spot cost trends for maximum input into such key decisions as whether to change a school schedule, which needs substantial lead time.

Ronald N. Strahonoski
Business Administrator
Valley View Community Unit School District
Bolingbrook-Romeoville, Illinois

In preparing a budget for year-round school, one ought to be able to answer or find the answer for the following:

1. How much of an increase is there in instructional materials and equipment?
2. What are the proportionate administrative costs?
3. How much less/more has to be budgeted for classroom space?
4. Do maintenance costs increase?
5. What is the increase in utility costs?
6. How much more must be planned for insurance?
7. Does capital outlay increase, decrease, or remain the same?
8. How much more must be budgeted for transportation?

The question uppermost in the minds of those thinking about the change to year-round school is how much more or less is it going to cost.

Is it a fact or a delusion: Year-round schools can be operated at a lower cost than traditional schools?

STAFFING AND INSERVICE

Charles E. Ruflen
Bear Creek-Columbine Area Superintendent
Jefferson County School District R-1
Lakewood, Colorado

Even though a school district may already have a negotiated agreement with its teacher's association, an addendum agreement should be reached between the two as it pertains to year-round school education.

Areas that need mutual agreement include, but are not limited to the following:

1. WORK WEEK AND WORK YEAR - Special attention must be given to what constitutes a typical full-year contract in a year-round program. Once this has been determined the minimum and maximum number of days a teacher can work must be addressed. In order to provide year-round coverage, the work year of the school psychologists, social workers, nurses, and speech therapists needs close examination.

2. SELECTION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH AN EXTENDED WORK YEAR - If teachers are permitted to extend their work year beyond the number of days that are typically worked in a traditional program, how does a school go about selecting who can and who cannot extend their contracts? Items to consider in making this decision could include teacher qualifications and individual requirements of the open position. When these factors are substantially equal, the extended contract could go to the teacher with the greatest length of service in the building, department or grade level, or in the district.

3. CLASSROOM CONDITIONS - Consideration must be given to providing whatever air treatment is necessary to make the environment within the schools comfortable and conducive to learning throughout the entire year.

4. SELECTION OF VACATION PATTERNS - Language needs to be agreed upon where conflicts arise in the selection of vacation patterns between members of a department, grade level, or team. Who has final responsibility in assigning teachers to a particular pattern and on what basis?

5. TRANSFERS - If an entire school district does not engage in year-round education, every effort should be made to allow teachers to transfer into and out of the year-round program.

6. SALARY - Teachers who work beyond the regular work year generally are compensated at their per diem rate of pay. Areas to address in the negotiating process include methods of payment for extended work days; how to pay teachers who begin their new work year prior to September; and how much teachers should get paid if they substitute while on vacation. Because of the uniqueness of year-round education and the unknown effects that it may have on conditions of employment, negotiations should be able to be reopened by mutual consent for purposes of additions, deletions, modifications, changes, or amendments.

The administrative staffing procedures established for year-round programs are also unique and require constant updating. Even though administrators typically work an extended work year, there are many days in the traditional year when students are not present and, for all intent and purposes, schools are closed.

Such is not the case in year-round programs. Keeping schools operable 245-250 days a year does not permit much uninterrupted planning during the day; it means a variety of vacation times--all while school is in session; and it increases the administrator's responsibilities for total school programs.

What then is a reasonable administrator's work year? What additional compensation, if any, should come his/her way for being responsible for an educational program that is ever going? Who should assume responsibility for the building when the principal vacations? There is no one answer to these questions, but each deserves an answer before embarking on a year-round program.

From my personal experience, maintenance and custodial personnel do not need to be increased for year-round programs. However, work schedules may need to be altered. Four, ten-hour day maintenance work schedules have been successful in some situations. Schools have also found that custodians can vacation throughout the year with little or no adverse effect on a building's cleanliness.

Because of increased clerical work associated with additional recordkeeping, registering, pupil accounting, bookkeeping tasks, and general secretarial chores incumbent in a year-round school operation, the number of secretaries may need to be increased over that found in a traditional school.

Differentiated staffing could help resolve or lessen some of the personnel concerns associated with year-round education. For example, an administrative team with well defined job descriptions and objectives and consisting of a principal, his/her assistants, a programmer, and a bookkeeper could permit efficient and effective functioning 12 months of the year. The addition of the bookkeeper to the administrative team could relieve the principal of many financial burdens while at the same time free a secretary from those tasks and enable her to become more involved with secretarial needs.

Teaching teams with varying roles and responsibilities could provide continuity and articulated programs of studies for students as they, as well as the teachers, progress through the instructional process, and as they move from one track, pattern, or quarter to another. Another type of differentiated staffing could be the development of a curriculum resource team assigned to the year-round schools. This team, functioning at the local level, composed of experts in English, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign language could assist the teachers in organizing, planning and teaching the curriculum; they could be directly involved in the ordering of instructional materials and equipment; and they could plan and conduct inservice programs.

The following format may have some merit as an individual school or school district contemplates the needs for staff development associated with the implementation of year-round programs. It anticipates a three-phase program progressing from orientation through needs assessment into program development for attending to the identified needs. It proposes involvement of people in planning and complementing the program--such involvement is usually a prerequisite for commitment.

Phase One's purpose would be orientation to the year-round model to be implemented. Items to be presented and discussed would include such things as the calendar and the model, provisions of the negotiated agreement, registration procedures, how dissemination of information about the model to the public will be handled, student activity participation during vacation times, time-lines to be followed, etc.

These meetings could be conducted by principals as information giving activities to acquaint staff members with the characteristics of the implementation model.

Phase Two would be a needs assessment involving all staff members. Emphasis here would be placed on the studying and identification of operational procedures and curriculum needs to make the program function in each building. These meetings could be conducted by "process-oriented" people working under the authority of the principal and involving all personnel in the generation of the needs.

Phase Three would be the planning and participation in inservice programs that were developed from the needs identified in Phase Two. Some of these inservice workshops and courses would likely pertain to individualized instructional techniques, grouping strategies, evaluating pupil progress, and the sequencing of materials.

All available school district and community resources should be utilized in the teaching of these programs.

A school district should make available as much financial and people resources as is necessary for the support of these staff development activities. Without on-going inservice and staff development programs, designed by those actually implementing year-round education, little success can be expected.

Responsibility for the supervision of year-round programs should rest primarily with each building principal. The school district, however, should be completely committed to supporting each school's needs with every available resource possible. If a program of year-round education includes a number of schools and involves students K-12, a director or co-ordinator, particularly in the development and early years of implementation would be of invaluable assistance to the schools.

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Ray Schneringer
Assistant Principal of Arvada West Senior High School
Jefferson County School District R-1
Arvada, Colorado

An evaluation committee was formed early in the 1973-74 school year in order to formulate a plan for evaluating the educational aspects of Concept 6. This committee was made up of personnel from the central administration building, an area superintendent, principals, teachers and parents. Many long hours were spent discussing ideas on what should or should not be included in the educational evaluation. Below I will briefly summarize the principal objectives of this evaluation.

The committee arrived at two operational objectives.

Number one was whether the Concept 6 year-round schedule could be operated in Jefferson County to present an instructional program that is educationally feasible for both elementary and secondary students commensurate with district expectations.

Operational objective two was to determine how planned educational experiences commesurate with district goals could be offered outside the confines of the traditional classroom, which employ a variety of resources including public institutions, cultural and business establishments, and natural environments.

Under the first operational objective there are five specific objectives we want to take a look at: (1) Will achievement of students in Concept 6 schools by grade level exhibit commesurate growth as measured by standardized testing scores when compared with the same data for the districts schools not involved in Concept 6? (2) Will the attendance ratio (ADA÷ADM) of Concept 6 elementary and junior high schools remain static or increase during each of the two years of the pilot project when compared to the base year 1973-74? (3) Will projected dropout rate of each Concept 6 school increase in either pilot year from the base year 1973-74?

(4) Will the average number of objectives in the three basic skills mastered by elementary (and where applicable, secondary) students in Concept 6 schools be commensurate with that of the students in the same grade in the rest of the district? (5) Will the assimilation of kindergarten students into Concept 6 schools be reported by teachers in each of the pilot years (on an instrument to be designed) as educationally sound, based upon their classroom experience?

Under the second operational objective there are three specific objectives the committee felt it important to observe: (1) To determine the availability and utilization of "fifth quarter" time for enrichment and remedial instruction. (2) To determine the availability and utilization of "Bonus Learning Sessions" for enrichment and remedial instruction. (3) To determine the utilization of the the "overlapping days" in the Concept 6 calendar as to their specific application in each elementary and secondary school in the Arvada West and Columbine pilot areas.

At this point in time we have no information concerning operational objective one. Data has just began to filter into the testing office. On operational objective two, dealing with the 5th term and Bonus Learning Sessions, data in terms of numbers of students, has been collected through the first three quarters.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CAREER EDUCATION AND YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

Dr. Arvin Blome
State Coordinator for Career Education
Colorado Department of Education
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education
Denver, Colorado

Vocational education--the exploratory and preparatory phases--is an integral part of career education.

Bringing the community resources into the school and taking the children from the sanctuary of the classroom into the community are necessary parts of career education, which can take place any day of the year. In fact, many of the seasonal career opportunities better lend themselves to summer or winter exploratory and preparatory possibilities than at any other time. Thus for seasonal activities, the year-round school is an asset to career education, and career education is a must for year-round schools.

Improved vertical and horizontal articulation among teachers has been one of the proven benefits of career education. This is certainly a necessary ingredient for the successful operation of a year-round school.

Many critics of career education say the concept really is not anything new. True, critics since the turn of the century have indicated we were not doing the job. A few examples:

In 1900, newspaper articles frequently appeared describing the rise and development of manual training, sort of the "Gay Nineties" version of career education. "The need of relating these courses to other parts of the school system was clearly perceived," the Milwaukee Sentinel published in August 1900. Accordingly, it was urged "not for the few, but for all; not only for high school but in earlier years; not for boys only but in suitable subjects for girls."

Frank W. Parsons, 1909 outlined three main steps in the procedure of choosing a vocation:

1. Clear understanding of yourself, aptitudes, abilities, interests, resources, limitations and other qualities.
2. A knowledge of the requirements and conditions of success, advantages and disadvantages, compensation, opportunities, and prospects in different lines of work.

3. True reasoning and decision making in relation to the first two groups of facts.

In 1914, John Dewey presented a paper at the National Vocational Guidance Association and National Society for Promotion of Industrial Education in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and pointed out to the Assembly: "A democratic education required no separation of vocational and academic training, advocating a unified system, rather than a dual system of education."

During the "Roaring Twenties," Dr. George Edmund Meyers, University of Michigan, stated that in choosing an occupation, the choice must be based on reliable, significant and adequate information. The individual must accumulate information about himself and the various occupational fields in the world of work, with special interest being given to those areas in which the student possessed interests and abilities.

Meyers urged "try-out experiences" to test the person in areas of special interest and to evaluate these experiences in relation to his abilities and limitations.

In the 1930's, the NYA and CCC set five goals for their activities in attempting to assist youth finish their education while earning a salary:

1. Help youth evaluate himself;
2. Help him make a vocational choice;
3. Help him plan a training program to achieve his choice;
4. Place him in work;
5. Follow up on his assignment.

In 1946, a series of regional conferences - "Education in the Years Ahead"--resulted in agreement on following points:

1. Secondary education was failing to provide adequately and properly for the life adjustment of a major percentage of secondary students;
2. Functional experiences in various curriculum areas are fundamental to any education program designed to meet the needs of youth;
3. Those entrusted with the education of teachers need a broadened viewpoint.

James Conant in 1959 advocated abolishing tracking, developing comprehensive school, enabling each student to individualize his program and emphasized that high school graduation should lead to either high education or a marketable skill.

President John F. Kennedy, in his 1963 budget message to The Congress, stated:

"An appraisal of the entire range of educational problems, viewing educational opportunities as a continuous life-long process, starting with pre-school training and extending through elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate education, vocation, vocational education, job training and retraining, adult education, and such general community educational resources as the public library.

"To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to The Congress with this message a single comprehensive education bill...For education cannot easily or wisely be divided in separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education."

FEATURED SPEAKERS

DR. CALVIN M. FRAZIER

Dr. Frazier

Dr. Calvin M. Frazier has served as Colorado's Commissioner of Education since August 1973. Prior to this appointment by the Colorado State Board of Education, Dr. Frazier was Deputy Superintendent of Schools in Colorado Springs School District 11, where his responsibilities involved K-12 curriculum, school plant planning, negotiations, planning and research, and principal staff development. In addition, he had major responsibilities in the establishment of the District's Concept 6 Year-Round Education program.

Born in Boulder, Colorado, Dr. Frazier later returned to that city, where he served as Associate Professor of Education in the University of Colorado's School of Education until going to Colorado Springs in 1969.

Dr. Frazier earned his AB degree in English from College of Puget Sound in Tacoma, Washington; he received his Master of Education degree in General Administration from the University of Oregon, where he later earned his Doctor of Education degree in Education Administration.

He started his education career in the Stevenson (Washington) School District, serving as elementary teacher, secondary teacher, elementary school principal, and director of special education. From 1962 to 1964 he served as Assistant to the Dean in the School of Education at the University of Oregon.

DR. CHARLES E. SILBERMAN

Dr. Silberman

Dr. Charles E. Silberman is director of the Ford Foundation-financed research project, " The Study of Law and Justice." From 1966 to 1970, while on leave from his position as a member of the Fortune Magazine editorial staff, he directed the Carnegie Corporation Study of the Education of Educators. His best-selling book, Crisis in the Classroom (Random House, 1970) is the product of that study.

Born in Des Moines, Iowa, Dr. Silberman was educated in the New York City public schools, Columbia College, and the Graduate Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University. He was made a Distinguished Member of Merrill House, Hampshire College, in 1970 and was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters by Kenyon College in 1972.

Dr. Silberman's most recent book, The Open Classroom Reader, was published by Random House in 1973.

Other works by Dr. Silberman include Crisis in Black and White, Random House, 1964, and The Myths of Automation, Harper and Row, 1966.

DR. EARL REUM

Dr. Earl Reum, student activities coordinator for the Jefferson County (Colorado) School District, is responsible for extra-class activities of more than 78,000 young people in the district. For the past 14 years he has directed the National Student Council Leadership Conference held annually at Camp Cheley in Estes Park, Colorado.

Dr. Reum

Constant requests for Dr. Reum to appear as a consultant-speaker result as much from his personal accomplishments as from his qualifications as a leader in education.

In addition to having taught English, speech, and social studies, Dr. Reum has introduced others to the mysteries of magic, juggling, and ventriloquism.

He was president of the student body of every school he attended, including Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, where he was graduated as the outstanding senior.

Dr. Reum has assembled nearly 25 books about leadership, student councils, and other vital areas of student activities. He earned his BA degree in philosophy from Catholic University; his MA in speech from the University of Denver, and his doctorate in educational curriculum also from the University of Denver.

Right -- Dr. Earl Reum, Student Activities Coordinator for the Jefferson County (CO) School District, uses some of his talents for magic, juggling, and ventriloquism--and his background in education--to discuss "Squaring Off with Year-Round Education." Several seminar participants requested a copy of his speech but, alas, it remains in his mind and not on paper. Suffice it to say that those who have yet to hear "the Wizard of Earl" have a treat in store for them. Just ask anyone who heard him as he "squared off with YRE" in Denver. Here he is making a point about today's scientific advances. According to Earl, "mayhem could be conducted in a crowded elevator and those not involved in said mayhem would continue staring straight ahead. Hence, he developed a "portable telephone system," complete with a buzzer device kept in his pocket. The sound, identical to the ring of a phone, startles passengers but none will admit openly that he heard anything, although some may pound the side of the head gently to remove the "ringing." After a brief interlude, Earl once again pushes the ring button and then slowly pulls the phone from his inside coat pocket--to the complete relief of all persons aboard the elevator. "Hello," says Earl. And after waiting for an answer, he nonchantly hands the phone to the person standing next to him saying, "It's for you." Earl added that it is a good device for superintendents and board members to have on their desks for use at appropriate times.

Biographies of Presenters

APKER, Dr. Wesley; Executive Secretary, National Association of State Boards of Education, 2480 W. 26th Ave., Suite 215-B, Denver, CO 80211. Formerly Superintendent, Evergreen School District, Vancouver, WA; Administrative Assistant to Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA: Administrative Assistant to Superintendent of Marysville (WA) Schools. BA, Pacific Lutheran University, Parkland, WA; Master's, Washington State University; Ed D, University of Washington.

BAISEL, Mrs. Marilyn; President, Eastridge Elementary PTO, Cherry Creek School District, CO; 2214 S. Dallas Ct., Denver, CO 80231. Member of PTO for four years; participated in public information campaign for 45-15 plan; assisted other communities with YRE planning. Serves on committee to set up Intersession Program; also on YRE evaluation committee.

BALL, Ray; Commissioner, Colorado High School Activities Association, 11351 Montview Blvd., Aurora, CO 80010. Formerly Assistant Commissioner, CHSAA; Principal Bear Creek High School, Jefferson County, CO: Dean of Boys, Lakewood High, Jefferson County; Teacher and Coach at Lakewood High. BA and MA, University of Denver.

BERES, David V.; Director, Bolingbrook Park District, Box 5, Bolingbrook, IL 60439. Formerly Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, Vigo County Park and Recreation Department, Terre Haute, In. BS and MS, Indiana State University; MA, Northern Illinois University.

Apker

Ball

Bindner

Bingle

Boonin

Brenner

BINDNER, Mrs. Mary; Member of YRE Committee for Jefferson County Schools, CO; 4490 S. Reed, Littleton, CO 80123; active for many years in PTA and Past President of Jefferson County Council. Member of State ESEA Title III Advisory Council; Jefferson County Historical Commission. BS, Northwestern University.

BINGLE, James D.; Member, Board of Directors of NCYRE; Route 2, Lindenwood Ln., Plainfield, IL 60544. Formerly Member and President of Board of Education for Valley View Public Schools, IL. Employed by Argonne National Laboratory, USAEC. Served as Township Tax Assessor, DuPage Twp., Will County, IL. BS, North Central College, Naperville, IL.

BLOME, Dr. Arvin, State Coordinator for Career Education, Colorado Department of Education, State Office Bldg., Denver, CO 80203. On leave from Colorado State University as Professor of Education, Coordinator of Career Education. Formerly with Montana State University, Western Kentucky University, and University of Wyoming; Principal, University Hospital and Laboratory School, State University of Iowa; BA, State College of Iowa; MA and Ph D, State University of Iowa.

BOONIN, Mrs. Lawrence; Director, Philadelphia Board of Public Education and Philadelphia Intermediate Unit 26; 1243 - 65th Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19126. Local Chairman, Advisory Commission for YRE, Library Committee, Sub-Committee on Day Care Centers; Vice President, Oak Lane Civic Association. Temple University and Neighborhood Playhouse School of the Theatre, New York, NY.

BRAINARD, Mrs. Muriel; Resource Specialist, Language Arts, Jefferson County School District, P.O. Box 15128, Denver, CO 80215. Former Teacher, Englewood (CO), Montana, Minnesota, Kansas. AB from St. Cloud (MN) State College; MA from University of Northern Colorado.

BRENNER, Mrs. Dottie; Team Leader, Vanderhoof Elementary, Jefferson County School District, 5875 Routt Ct., Arvada, CO 80004. Formerly Teacher, Salina, KS. Has served NEA affiliates on committees, task forces, and boards of directors; Rules Chairperson for CEA since 1970; attended CEA Delegate Assemblies, NEA Representative Assembly. Graduate of Fort Hays (KS) State College.

CAMPBELL, Dr. Bruce; Legislative Officer, New Jersey Department of Education, 225 W. State St., Trenton, NJ 08625. Formerly the Department's Director of Extended School Year Programs; School Administrator, Principal, and Teacher. Member of Board of Directors of NCYRE and Chairman of its State Departments of Education Committee. AB and MA, William Paterson College of New Jersey. Completed doctoral work at Rutgers.

CHRISTOPHER, Mrs. Joy; Director, Cherry Creek Demonstration Center for YRE, and Team Leader, Intermediate Open Space, Cunningham YRE Elementary, Cherry Creek School District, 9659 E. Mississippi Ave., Denver, CO 80231. Formerly employed in Limestone (ME) Public Schools; Ramey AFB Schools, Puerto Rico; Austin (TX) Schools. Member of Board of Directors of NCYRE.

DALGLEISH, Dr. George H., Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Formerly Director of Secondary Education, Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher in Colorado Springs. BA, University of Colorado; Master's, University of Northern Colorado; Ph D, University of Colorado.

DREWES, Dr. Harald; Member of Advisory Committees at all levels; Co-Chairman of Financial Evaluation Sub-Committee of Jefferson County (CO) YRE Committee. Employed as Geologist by U.S. Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center, Bldg. #25, Denver, CO 80225. BS, MA, and Ph D, Yale.

Campbell

Christopher

Dalgleish

Drewes

Earthman

Edwards

Foulks

EARTHMAN, Dr. Glen I.; Associate Professor of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Room 2088 Deering Hall, Blacksburg, VA 20461. Formerly Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Drake University; Executive Director School Planning, Philadelphia Public Schools; Assistant Professor, University of North Dakota; Principal and Teacher. AB and MA, University of Denver; Ed D, University of Northern Colorado.

EDWARDS, Dr. Franklin; Director of Community Education, Phoenix-Union High School System, South Mountain High School, 5401 S. 7th St., Phoenix, AZ 85005. Formerly Administrative Assistant and Boys' Advisor, Phoenix-Union High; Teacher. Member of Board of Directors, NCYRE. BA, Prairie View College, Hempstead, TX; MM, University of Colorado; Ph D, Arizona State University.

ENGLEBY, Mrs. Lynn; Member of many education committees; 5359 W. Roxbury Pl., Littleton, CO 80123. Member, Normandy Elementary School Advisory Committee, Columbine Area Advisory Committee, Concept 6 Coordinating Committee, Concept 6 Kindergarten Screening Committee and Entry Evaluation Committee, Jefferson County, CO. Formerly Teacher in Rome, NY. BA, Duke University.

FOULKS, Thom; County Commissioner, 5311 Alta Loma Rd., Colorado Springs, CO 80918. Formerly with U.S. Air Force in assignments including technical and academic instructor, information specialist, radio and TV station manager and news director, newspaper editor. Created TV programs supporting YRE. Met college-level GED requirements through U.S. Armed Forces Institute Program.

FREDERICK, Dr. Edward C.; Provost, University of Minnesota Technical College-Waseca, Waseca, MN 56093. Formerly Superintendent, Southern School of Agriculture and Experiment Station, Waseca, and Animal Scientist and Instructor, Northwest School and Experiment Station, Crookston, MN. Active in both FFA and 4-H activities. BS, MS and Ph D, University of Minnesota.

GERBOTH, Mrs. Donna; Secretary, Principal of Arvada West High, Jefferson County School District, 11325 Allendale Dr., Arvada, CO 80004. Holds Professional Standards Certificate from the National Association of Educational Secretaries and Jilly Award for Distinctive Services Rendered, presented by Jefferson County Association of Educational Secretaries.

Frederick Gerboth Glines Gove Grady Hamilton Rev. Hansen

GLINES, Dr. Don E.; Year-Round Education Consultant, California State Department of Education, State Education Bldg., 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814. Formerly Professor of Education and Co-Director of Center for Altruistic and Experiential Education, Mankato (MN) State College; Director of Wilson Campus School, Mankato. Newly elected President of NCYRE. BS from Springfield (MA); MS and Ph D from the University of Oregon.

GOVE, James R.; Assistant Superintendent, Valley View Community Unit School District, Romeoville, IL 60441. Formerly Director, Multi-Media Services; Director, Gifted Programs; Speech Therapist for Valley View Schools. Credited with designing 45-15 concept. President, NCYRE. BS and MS, Indiana State University.

GRADY, Dr. Roslyn M.; Director of Research, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Formerly School Psychologist, Colorado Springs Schools; Guest Instructor of Graduate Statistics and Research Design, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs; Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Alabama. Ed B, Rhode Island College of Education; MA and Ph D, University of Alabama.

HAMILTON, Miss Robin; 9th-grader, Drake Junior High, Jefferson County. 5857 Parfet Ct., Arvada, CO 80004. Presently serving as Vice-President of Student Body, Drake Junior High; Member of Yearbook Staff, Pep Club, and Girls' All-Star Basketball Team.

HAMPSON, Robert; Administrative Assistant, Personnel Services, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso Stl, Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Formerly Test Consultant for Colorado Springs Schools; High School Teacher and Coach, Elkton, SD. BS and M Ed, South Dakota State University.

HANSEN, Richard D.; Principal, Eastridge Community Elementary School, Cherry Creek School District, 11177 E. Wesley Ave., Denver, CO 80232. Formerly Assistant Principal and Team Leader, Cherry Creek; Supervisor of Student Teachers and Interns, St. Cloud (MN) State College; Teaching Assistant Principal, Teacher and Coach, Annandale (MN) Public Schools. BS and MS degrees.

HANSEN, The Rev. Wesley M. Hansen; Pastor, Littleton Baptist Church, 1400 W. Caley Ave., Littleton, CO 80120. Formerly Bible College Department Chairman and Professor; Missionary in South America. Bible Institute Diploma; BA in Philosophy, Master of Divinity, and course work completed for Master of Theology.

LEFT -- NCYRE President James R. Gove, Assistant Superintendent, Valley View Community Unit School District, Romeoville, IL, presides over the Opening Session of the 1975 Year-Round Education Seminar. Visible on the platform are Dr. Calvin Frazier, Colorado's education chief; Mrs. Robin Johnston, Chairman of Colorado's State Board of Education; Lewis E. Stieghorst, Vice Chairman of the Colorado State Board and member of the Jefferson County (CO) Board of Education; Dr. John McLain, NCYRE Secretary (partially hidden behind the podium), and George Jensen, member of the YRE Board.

G. Henderson P. Henderson Henson Hentschke Hosler Johnston

HARDING, Del; Director of Information for Jefferson County School District, P.O. Box 15128, Denver, CO 80215. Formerly Education Editor for daily newspaper. Vice President, National School Public Relations Association. Graduate of University of Nebraska.

HENDERSON, Dr. Gene; Superintendent, Francis Howell School District, St. Charles County, MO 63301. Formerly Superintendent of Chamois (M)) Schools and Martinsville (MO) Schools. Teacher of instrumental and vocal music. Member, Board of Directors, NCYRE. BM, Central Methodist College; MM, Indiana University, and Ed D, University of Missouri-Columbia.

HENDERSON, Dr. Patrick; Superintendent, Sunnyside School District, 470 E. Valencia Rd., Tucson, AZ 85706. Has spent 27 years in education as College Instructor, Administrator, and Teacher. BA, Arizona State University; MA, Northern Arizona University; Ed D, University of Arizona.

HENSON, Dr. E. Curtis; Assistant Superintendent for Career Education, Atlanta Public Schools, Career Education Center, 2960 Forrest Hill Dr., S.W., Atlanta, GA 30315. Coordinator, Metropolitan School Development Council, Atlanta; Faculty, University of Missouri-Kansas City, University of Tennessee, Auburn University; Secondary School Principal and Teacher. Administrative Coordinator, NCYRE. BS, MS, Ed D, Auburn University.

HENTSCHKE, R. Guilbert C.; Associate Professor, University of Rochester, 455 Mt. Vernon Ave., Rochester, NY 14620. Formerly on faculty of Columbia University, Stanford University, University at San Francisco; Teacher, East Side Union School District, San Jose, CA. BA, Princeton University; MA and Ph D, Stanford University.

HOSLER, Xen; Coordinator, Vocational Education, Jefferson County School District, P. O. Box 15128, Denver, CO 80215.

JOHNSTON, Mrs. Robin; Chairman, Colorado State Board of Education, State Office Bldg., Denver, CO 80203. Member, Steering Committee, Diagnostic Center, Denver Public Schools; Advisory Board, Autistic Center; Advisory Board, Denver Public Schools; State Advisory Committee for ESEA Title I and Sub-Committee for Migrant Children; Committee to Improve Education for Children with Learning Problems; Coordinator, Aides to Educationally Handicapped Children and Special Summer Program for Children with Learning Problems. Graduate geologist.

Right -- Robin Johnston, Chairman of the Colorado State Board of Education, host for the Seventh National YRE Seminar, extends greetings to the some 375 persons attending the opening session of the seminar. Seated next to her is Lewis Stieghorst, State Board Vice-Chairman.

JOSEPH, Mrs. Syd; President, Colorado PTA; 870 S. Hudson St., Denver, CO 80222. Member, Committee on Educational Development; Colorado Council on Alcohol Education; Colorado Centennial-Bicentennial Committee; Committee for Community Schools; Colorado Department of Education's Certification, Legislation, and Year-Round Schools Committees; Colorado Department of Health Council on Health Education.

KARLSON, Richard J; Treasurer, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Formerly Secretary-Treasurer of Ivywild Sanitation District; Accountant for Stratton Estate, Colorado Springs. Member, United Fund Admissions and Allocations Committee. BS, Kansas State University.

KELSEY, F. LAMAR, FAIA; President, Lamar Kelsey Associates, Inc., 430 N. Tejon St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Elected to College of Fellows in the American Institute of Architects for "notable contribution to the advancement of the profession of architecture by his achievement in design." Graduate of University of Illinois.

KLEIN, Mrs. Nancy; Paraprofessional, Russell Junior High School, Colorado Springs School District, 3825 E. Montebello Dr., W., Colorado Springs, CO 80918. Coaches Girls' Volleyball and Softball Teams. BA, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. Taking education courses to qualify as a certificated teacher.

Joseph Karlson Kelsey Klein Koeppe Knueppel Lebegern

KOEPPE, Dr. Richard P.; Superintendent, Cherry Creek School District, 4700 S. Yosemite St., Englewood, CO 80110. Formerly Assistant Superintendent, Denver Public Schools; Director of Pupil Services, Madison (WI) Schools; Director of Pupil Personnel Services, Oconomowoc (WI) Schools; Faculty of University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. BS, Wisconsin State College; MS and Ph D, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

KNUEPPEL, Dr. Daniel; Principal, Tenafly High School, Columbus Dr., Tenafly, NJ 07670. Formerly Principal and Assistant Principal, Pelham (NY) Memorial High School; Teacher. BA, Valparaiso (IN) University; MA and Ed D, New York University.

LEBEGERN, George; Curriculum Coordinator - Social Studies K-12, Pennsbury School District, Yardley Ave., Fallsington, PA 19054. Baseball Coach. Formerly Teacher. Chairman, Pennsbury Bicentennial Leadership Committee. BA, The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina; M Ed, Temple University.

Right -- Colorado's Commissioner of Education, Dr. Calvin M. Frazier, delivered a major address during the seminar on "Year-Round Education -- Dream and Reality." Dr. Frazier recounted many of his experiences in establishing a Concept 6 plan while Deputy Superintendent of Schools in Colorado Springs School District. With him at the head table are Robin Johnston and Lewis Stieghorst, both officers on the Colorado State Board of Education.

Lewis MacDonnell McConnell McLain Milligan Mounie

LEWIS, Ms. Nancy; Recreation Supervisor in charge of General Recreation, Colorado Springs Park and Recreation Department; 955 Westmoreland Rd., Colorado Springs, CO 80907. Formerly Recreation Specialist, Assistant Director Second Horizon Senior Center, Colorado Springs Park and Recreation Department. University of Nebraska, University of Colorado, El Paso Community College.

MacDONNELL, Miss Nancy; President of the Student Body, Drake Junior High School, Jefferson County School District, 12550 W. 52nd Ave., Arvada 80002. Member of National Junior Honor Society, Pep Club, Yearbook Staff.

McCONNELL, Thomas J., Jr: Director, Computer Center, Atlanta Public Schools, 218 Pryor St., S.W., Atlanta, GA 30303. Formerly Staff Member of the Computer Center, University of Georgia; Consultant to both educational agencies and the computing industry. BS, Georgia State University.

McLAIN, Dr. John D.; Director, Research-Learning Center (including a Flexible All-Year School, K-12), Clarion State College, Clarion, PA 16214. Formerly College Professor, Curriculum Director, Principal, Teacher. Secretary-Treasurer, NCYRE. Directed 2nd National Seminar on YRE. BS, Southern Oregon College; MS and Ed D, University of Oregon.

MILLIGAN, Mrs. Mary; Teacher, Penrose Elementary School, Colorado Springs School District, 4285 S. Nonchalant Crcl., Colorado Springs, CO 80917. Formerly Teacher at Francis-Howell School District, St. Charles, MO. Co-author of "How We Did It" brochure for Colorado Springs' YRE Concept 6 plan.

MORGAN, Mrs. True; Principal, Holly Ridge Elementary School, Cherry Creek School District, 3301 S. Monaco Pkwy., Denver, CO 80222. Formerly Curriculum Consultant, Special Reading Teacher, and Teacher. Gave administrative assistance to planning and implementing of Cunningham YRS, Cherry Creek Schools. BA and MA, University of Northern Colorado.

MOUNIE, Dr. James; Assistant Superintendent for Research, Planning and Development, Virginia Beach City Public Schools, P.O. Box 6038, Virginia Beach, VA 23456. Formerly on faculty of Old Dominion University, Tidewater Community College, and College of William and Mary; Director of Secondary Education, Principal, Virginia Beach Schools; Assistant Principal, Teacher, BA, M Ed, and Ed D, College of William and Mary.

MUELLER, Dr. Ernest H.; Superintendent, Pennsbury School District, Yardley Ave., Fallsington, PA 19054. Formerly Assistant Superintendent, Prince William County (VA) Public Schools, Director of School-Community Relations; Research Associate, University of Virginia; Editor and Assistant Editor, education publications; Consultant; Assistant Principal; Teacher. Member, Board of Directors, NCYRE. BA, MA, Syracuse (NY) University; Ed D, University of Virginia.

NICHOLS, C. J.; Chairman, Board of Education, Sunnyside Public Schools, Tucson, AZ; 338 W. Elvira Rd., Tucson, AZ 85706. Employed by American Airlines. Has held all offices, Arizona School Board Association; Life-Time Member, National School Board Association; has held all offices, Sunnyside Schools Board of Education. Southwestern College, Winfield, KS; University of Arizona.

PARKS, Dr. David J.; Assistant Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 4094 Deering Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061. Formerly Assistant Professor, George Peabody College for Teachers; Principal, Teaching Principal, and Teacher. Administrative Coordinator for NCYRE. BS, State University of New York at Potsdam; MS, State University of New York at Plattsburgh; and Ph D, Syracuse (NY) University.

PASCOE, Dr. David D.; Associate Superintendent, La Mesa-Spring Valley School District, 4750 Date Ave., La Mesa, CA 92041. Formerly Director of Instructional Materials; Assistant Professor, San Diego State University; Consultant to California State Department of Education; College Instructor. Serves as Consultant to U.S. Agency for International Development. Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate, University of California, Los Angeles.

PORTER, Dr. Charles; Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Community Education Development, Colorado State University. Formerly Principal, Teacher. President-Elect of National Community Education Association. Earned degrees at Michigan State University and Western Michigan University.

RICE, Dr. Paul; Instructor/Administrative Assistant to Divisional Director, Division of Administrative and Educational Services, College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061. Formerly Administrative Assistant on Secondary Level; Teacher. Member, board of Directors, NCYRE. B Ed, M Ed, University of New Hampshire; Ed D, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Mueller

Nichols

Parks

Pascoe

Porter

Rice

Richards

Rubinstein

Rutter

RICHARDS, Delaine T.; Principal, El Camino Real School, Irvine Unified School District, 4782 Karen Ann Ln., Irvine, CA 92705. Formerly instructor, Chapman College and Fullerton Junior College; Assistant Principal, Teacher, and Coach. BS, Midland College, Fremont, NE; MS, University of Nebraska.

RICKETTS, Arvel R.; Recently assigned as Principal of new Doherty High School, Colorado Springs School District. Former Assignment, Principal of Russell Junior High, 3825 E. Montebello Dr., W., Colorado Springs, CO 80918. Also former Assistant Principal, Counselor, Teacher, BA, Hofstra College, Hempstead, NY; NA, University of Northern Colorado.

RUBINSTEIN, Martin; Director, Department of Support Programs, Dade County Public Schools, 1444 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, FL 33132. Formerly Project Manager of Quinmester Program, Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, Teacher. Received education at University of Miami, Teacher's College, Columbia University, and Florida Atlantic University.

RUFIEN, Charles E.; Area Superintendent, Bear Creek-Columbine Schools, Jefferson County School District, 3115 S. Kipling, Morrison, CO 80465. Formerly Principal, Assistant Principal, and Teacher-Coach. Served on Jefferson County Task Force To Study YRE. Undergraduate and graduate degrees from University of Colorado.

RUTTER, William; Superintendent, Valley View Community Unit School District 365U, Romeoville, IL. Formerly Interim and Deputy Superintendent; Principal, Lockport, IL; Assistant Principal, Teacher. Bachelor's Degree, Illinois State University; Master's, Northern Illinois University.

SCHNERINGER, Ray; Assistant Principal, Arvada West High School, Jefferson County School District, 11325 Allendale Dr., Arvada, CO 80002. Formerly Counselor, Teacher. Served on Jefferson County Concept 6 Committee and Concept 6 Educational Feasibility Committee. BS, Regis College, Denver; MA, University of Northern Colorado.

SCHUMACHER, Edward C.; Executive Director, Denver Area Council of Camp Fire Girls, 7075 Dover Way, Arvada, CO 80002. Formerly National Director of Field Services, National Director of Camping Services, Camp Fire Girls; Executive Director, Children's Fresh Air Fund, Baltimore; Teacher. BS, Towson (MD) State College; M Ed, Western Maryland College.

SERVETTER, Dr. Leonard; Superintendent-Elect, Chula Vista City School District, 84 East J St., Chula Vista, CA 92012. Formerly Assistant Superintendent. Had administrative responsibility for implementing YRE in seven of the District's schools. Author of a book titled "Year Round Schools Program: A Case Study." Earned doctorate at Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.

Schneringer Schumacher Servetter Short Stieghorst Strahanski Tczap

SHELLEY, Verne; Director of Personnel, Cherry Creek School District, 4700 S. Yosemite St., Englewood, CO 80110. Formerly Principal of Cherry Creek's Cunningham Elementary during the time the District's year-round plan went into effect; school district staff of Valley View Community School District, Romeoville, IL, and assisted with YRE there. Former Member, NCYRE Board of Directors.

SHORT, Ms. Chris; Teacher, Mollala (OR) Grade School; Rt. 1, Box 221-C, Colton, OR 97017. President of Local Educational Association, Member of Mollala Negotiating Team; Member of Legislative Advisory Council of Oregon Education Association. BA, University of Oregon; MS candidate at Portland State University.

STIEGHORST, Lewis E.; Vice-Chairman, Colorado State Board of Education; State Office Bldg., Denver, CO 80203. Formerly Chairman. Senior Member, Jefferson County (CO) Board of Education; formerly Treasurer. Also formerly chairman of the nominating committee of the Colorado Association of School Boards, Denver. Electrical Engineer with Westinghouse Electric Corporation. BS from University of Wisconsin. Graduate studies at Wisconsin and University of Denver.

STRAHANOSKI, Ronald N.; Business Administrator, Valley View Community Unit School District, Parkview School, Dalhart Ave., Romeoville, IL 60441. Formerly Coordinator of 45-15, Administrative Assistant, Personnel Department. Also formerly School Board member, four years as President, Milne-Kelvin Grove District, Lockport, IL. Bachelor's and Master's degrees.

TCZAP, Mrs. Janet; 17215 W. 57th St., Golden, CO. Member, Jefferson County School District Concept 6 Central Coordinating Committee, Arvada West Advisory Group. Co-Chairman, Community Attitudes Evaluation Committee for Concept 6. Former Teacher, Denver, Seattle, Houghton (MI), and Norfolk (VA). BS, Southwest Missouri State University.

THATCHER, Dr. Dwain L.; Research Supervisor, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Formerly Research Associate; Author of TICCIT instructional development project; Teacher, Colorado Springs, Mancos (CO), Henderson (NV). AB, University of Northern Colorado; MS, Kansas State University; MA, Boston College; Ed D, Brigham Young University.

TRIPLETT, N. B.; Principal, Mesa Verde High School, 7400 Lauppe Ln., Citrus Heights, CA 95610. Formerly Assistant Superintendent, Placer High School, Auburn, CA; Assistant Principal, Dean of Students, Jefferson Union High School, Daly City, CA; Counselor, Teacher, Coach. AB and MA, San Francisco State College.

WALDO, Bruce S; Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Aurora, 16th and Elmira Sts., Aurora, CO 80010. Formerly Executive Director, Hyland Hills Park and Recreation District; Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Irving (TX). BS, North Texas State University. Certificated as Professional Parks and Recreation Administrator, States of Texas and Colorado.

WARNER, Thurman; Coordinator, Information Services, Colorado Springs School District, 1115 N. El Paso St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Former District Public Relations Officer, Colorado Springs; Las Vegas, NM; Teacher. BS, Drake University; MA, New Mexico Highlands University.

WASHBURN, Dr. John, Jr.; Director, Elementary Instruction, Great Neck Public Schools, 345 Lakeville Rd., Great Neck, NY 11020. Formerly, Principal, Cunningham Elementary School, Denver, CO; Consultant, Cincinnati Public Schools; Faculty Member, Brandeis University; Team Leader, Teacher. BS, Central State College, Edmond, OK; Ed M, Ed D, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

WHITE, Dr. Wayne; Assistant Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Rt. 1, Box 98, Auburn, VA 22011. Formerly Superintendent, Brevard County (FL), Fayettesville, AR. Siloam Springs, AR; Supervising Principal, Principal, Teacher. Past President, NCYRE. Member, National Academy of School Executives. BS, University of Arkansas; Ed D, University of Arkansas.

Thatcher

Triplett

Waldo

Warner

Washburn

Wm. White

Williams

WHITE, Dr. William; Director, Instructional Planning and Development, Jefferson County School District, P.O. Box 15128, Denver, CO 80215. Formerly Director of Curriculum; Principal, Arvada West High School (now a Concept 6 school), Dean of Boys, and Teacher. BA from University of Cincinnati, and MA and ED D from the University of Denver.

WILLIAMS, Robert H.; Superintendent, Rialto Unified School District, 182 E. Walnut Ave., Rialto, CA 92376. Formerly Administrative Director; Director of Elementary Education and Principal, Hayward (CA); College Instructor, Teacher. President, Western Association of Year-Round Schools. Member, State Year-Round School Committee. AB, University of California-Berkeley; MA, California State University, San Francisco

Wiman

Wolff

Womack

WIMAN, John L.; President, Board of Education, Colorado Springs School District; 421 N. Tejon St., Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Life Member of Colorado Springs Jaycees. Licensed Agent and Broker for Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co. Member of Chartered Life Underwriters (CLU). Former President, Colorado Springs Association Life Underwriters and Southern Colorado CLU Society.

WOLFF, Mrs. Luree; Secretary to Principal, Cunningham Elementary YRS, Cherry Creek School District, 9659 E. Mississippi Ave., Denver, CO 80231. Formerly Clerk. Professional Standards Program of National Association of Educational Secretaries, Colorado State University, University of Northern Colorado.

WOMACK, Mrs. Ruth; Principal, Penrose Year-Round School, Colorado Springs School District, 4285 S. Nonchalant Crcl., Colorado Springs, CO 80917. Formerly Principal of Pike Elementary School, Colorado Springs. President, Colorado Springs Elementary Principals Association. Past President of Colorado Association of School Executives; Past Member, Board of Directors, Colorado Association of School Executives; Bachelor's, Oklahoma State University; Master's, University of Colorado.